DABNEY

Fiction No Defence of Truth.

BAP
D114

SCB
10526

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2011 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

http://www.archive.org/details/fictionnodefence00dabn

# Fiction, No Defence of Truth:

OR A

# REVIEW

OF

# THEODOSIA EARNEST.

Reprinted from the Central Presbyterian.

RICHMOND:
WILLIAM H. CLEMMITT, PRINTER.
1859.

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JUL 12 1946
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BAP
B114

NOTE.—The following Review is reprinted from the "Central Presbyterian," in which it appeared first in weekly numbers. This is the apology offered to the reader, for the few typographical errors, which have been transferred from the hurried forms of the newspaper press, into this more permanent publication. The following Table of Errata will enable the reader to correct them for himself—

## ERRATA.

On Title Page, and heading of each page, for "Theodosia Earnest," read, "Theodosia Ernest."

On p. 5, for "*role*," read "*rõle*."

On p. 5, for "redoutable," read "redoubtable."

On p. 12, for "prosecute," read "persecute."

On p. 12, for "Presbyterian works," read "Presbyterian words."

On p. 22, for "heroines," read "heroine's."

On p. 55, for "Jews," read "Jew."

On p. 64, for "eklesia," read "ekklēsia."

On p. 86, for "breed," read "Creed."

On p. 116, for "Let us see Bingham," &c., read, "Let us see—Bingham concurs," &c.

On p. 133, for "illustratrate," read "illustrate."

On p. 140, erase the marks of quotation from the author's synopsis of R. Hall's argument. So, on p. 141.

On p. 148, line 4, erase words: "the principles of."

# Fiction, No Defence of Truth:

OR A

# REVIEW

OF

# THEODOSIA EARNEST.

by
Robert L. Dabney D.D.

---

RICHMOND:
WILLIAM H. CLEMMITT, PRINTER.
1859.

# REVIEW.

---

A FRIEND having recently urged us to read some of the remarkable Immersionist Novels of which we have heard so much for a few years, we have procured a couple, and perused them with great amusement. One of them is a Novel by a lady, in which the heroine marries a Presbyterian youth, son of a sturdy old ruling elder, adheres to her close communion principles in her father-in-law's house, in spite of the most ruthless persecution, and at length by dint of perseverance, patience, and the irresistible logic of an old, illiterate, negro woman, conquers her husband and a whole batch of Presbyterians including a parson to her own narrow creed. Surely our immersionist neighbors must consider this the era of the third Punic war of their spiritual commonwealth, their approaching *ultima dies*; that their very women leave the nursery and the kitchen, and come forth to

the combat, armed with their trenchant pens dipped in the concentrated gall of Drs. Carson, Booth and Campbell! Yet the sorry luck of the Amazon whose polemic emprize we have witnessed, we think, should be a warning to the rest of "the Sex," to abide by the spirit of Horace's wise advice *Ne sutor ultra crepidam:* "Mistress; better stick to your thimble." The paltry style, the literary blunders, and the feeble argument of this work which our gallantry requires us to leave nameless, place it beneath criticism.

Next, we have the famous *Romance*, of "Theodosia Earnest or the Heroine of Faith," from the press of Graves, Marks & Co., Nashville, Tenn. 1857. Eighteenth Thousand. This is a work *ad captandum vulgus*, badly printed on mean paper; and illustrated with execrable daubs of wood cuts representing the absurdities of "baby-sprinkling," and the contrasted glories of dipping; and adorned with a frontispiece which exhibits the lovely Theodosia herself. The book is evidently gotten up "for the million." The last mentioned picture, at least, deserves to be called "a speaking portrait." While we cannot compliment the artist on having successfully reproduced the maidenly lovliness which the "Heroine of Faith" is said

to have possessed: (inasmuch as the face is most decisively ill-favoured,) yet he deserves the higher praise of having accurately embodied the ideal of the young she-polemic expressed in the author's narrative. The brazen pertness, the vixenish tenacity, the self-conceit, appropriate to the *role* which she is represented as playing, are all, most truthfully represented, in a coarse face, bedizzened profusely with limp ringlets.

In order that the reader may at once familiarize himself with the new gospel of these polemic fictions, he must understand that the *Faith* for which Theodosia exhibits her heroism, is not faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, but faith in dipping. The author himself represents her as being eminently possessed of the former, while still a benighted Presbyterian, and as being entirely undisturbed in its exercise. No, henceforth simple faith on the Saviour does not constitute any one a moral hero, but confidence in the dogmatism of this water-gospel. And this is the first foretaste of the impieties with which the reader will be nauseated as he proceeds.

In a preface to a sort of appendix, contained in the latest edition (as we suppose it to be) the publisher, Mr. J. R. Graves, rather complains that the redoutable book

had received no notice from the hands of Presbyterians up to that time, with the exception of a slight (and slighting) article from Dr. N. L. Rice, in the St. Louis Presbyterian. It seems, he fears we poor Presbyterians will scarcely make a resistence stout enough to give the combativeness of the author and his publishers a satisfactory glow, in drubbing us. Now we felt upon coming to this, that we had reached the point where forbearance ceases to be a virtue. The temptation became irresistible to undeceive Mr. J. R. Graves & Co. by informing him and all the world, that what he had mistaken for fear on the part of Presbyterians, was only contempt. Seeing that our Christian forbearance, and our disgust at an assault so unworthy of a Christian denomination, have been thus misunderstood, we feel that it is both a right and duty to speak out, and we hereby assure Mr. J. R. Graves & Co. and their anonymous author, that when we have done with them they will no longer have any ground to complain of being unnoticed by Presbyterians.

1. The tenor of both these works is to represent Presbyterians as given to persecution, intolerant, ignorant of the reasons of

their own faith, and almost stupidly foolish in their defence of them, an easy prey to proselyters, and priest-ridden by their doctors of divinity. In the work first described, the immersionist young lady is pictured as subjected to a most painful persecution by her Presbyterian father-in-law, because she could not conscientiously commune with him. In Theodosia Earnest, the Presbyterian pastor is described, with his people, in all the colors above mentioned. Now there are doubtless individual Presbyterians who are intolerant, and others who are ill-informed, gullible, prejudiced as there are such unfortunate persons in all other denominations, even the purest. But is it truthful to embody such cases, as representative of Presbyterianism? A representative case must be so chosen, as to be true to the general average, at least, of the class. It is perfectly well known to this anonymous scribbler and his publishers, that Presbyterians are not, as a denomination intolerant or persecuting towards other evangelical Christians, nor less informed of the reasons for their own tenets; nor are they usually an easy prey to the sectarian proselyter. When that traitorous Mother of Mischief, Harriet Beecher Stowe, launched her in-

famous "Uncle Tom's Cabin" against the slaveholders, this was just the ground upon which all fair men condemned it, as a villainous slander. There have been individual slaveholders, who have been unjust enough to sell industrious and honest slaves to slave dealers. There have been such cases at the South, as that of the monster Legare who tormented his slave to death. Who denies it? So there have been men at the North, who have abused domestic relations, to torment their children and murder their wives. But herein, we urged and with irrefragrable justice, is the wickedness and falsehood of this abolition novel, that it takes the rare outrages of southern society, and makes them representative of our customary state. So we reason concerning these polemical novels. They select the rare exceptions of Presbyterian character, for the representative cases; they are therefore but slanders, they deserve to be judged by the same rule with the vile and malignant assault of the above mentioned high priestess of discord.

2. But the disposition to misrepresent Presbyterians is still more openly manifested in the details of the work. One of the charges again and again made against them

is, *that they expel from their communion*, those who propose to seek immersion, and the fellowship of immersionist congregations. On page 102 of Theodosia Earnest, the Presbyterian pastor is represented as threatening her in the following terms, to deter her from the farther investigation of the question:

"And now, before I take my leave, I feel it my duty solemnly to warn you before God, to take heed where you are going. I should be greatly pained, if we should find it necessary to expel you from the church."

"Expel me from the church! Why Mr. Johnson," &c.

Again: on page 269, the church session of the Presbyterian church is represented as holding a meeting, with a Doctor of Divinity and President of College, and another minister besides Mr. Johnson, as advisers—Theodosia has now been dipped: and the pastor is represented as stating the case thus:

"We understand that Miss Earnest, while her name was still standing as a member upon our record, has gone to a Baptist society, solicited immersion, and has actually been immersed by a Baptist preacher. By this act she has undoubtedly severed all

connexion with our church, and must of necessity be excluded from *our communion*. The only question is, whether we are bound to make the usual citation to appear, and answer to the charge."

Now it is *possible* that in so large a denomination as the Presbyterian, some case may have happened, where a church session so far misunderstood our polity, as to propose discipline against a member who designed to leave his church for some other branch of the church catholic. But we do not believe there ever was such a case. If there was, it was a rare exception. This religious novel, by introducing the incident as a part of the tale, evidently designs to represent it as *regular Presbyterian usage*. The whole scope of the book is to exemplify Immersionism *versus* Presbyterianism; and therefore, unless the instance were a fair representation of our usage, it should have no place in the story. But if the reader would know how just this representation is, let him consult the Minutes of our General Assembly for the year 1839, page 177. This Judicatory, the supreme regulator in all our denomination, resolves; "That in all cases where members of any of our churches apply for dismission to unite with a church

of another denomination, the proper course is to give a certificate of Christian character only."

The Presbytery of Hudson requesting the rule to be rescinded, as being not sufficiently courteous to other denominations, the Assembly of 1848, Minutes, p. 22, reply:

"The Presbytery of Hudson has misapprehended the spirit and scope of the resolution in question. It is neither a censure on the individuals, nor the churches to which they seek to be dismissed, but sets forth the only fact which it is important that those churches should know."

The Assembly here *declares*, (it does not institute *de novo*,) the proper usage. And such is the liberal and fraternal spirit in which our denomination has always, so far as we know, recognized the Christian character of all other evangelical churches, and the right of Presbyterians to go from us to them if they see fit. We cheerfully commend them, by testimonials of their good standing, to the brethren with whom they wish to unite; and then as they are no longer exclusively ours, we of course remove their names from our communion roll. Where a member does as Theodosia is represented as doing, goes away without

deigning to say "Good-bye;" of course we can only do the latter act of the two, remove the name from our communion roll. We are allowed no opportunity to give the testimonials, for they are not asked. Where then, did the author of Theodosia get the notion of our excommunicating such a member? The reader may find it in the current usage of the Immersionist churches, which, as is well known, do expel those members who commune with the other branches of Christ's church—that the Presbyterian church should be represented as guilty of such intolerance as the author's church currently practices, we justly resent, as an odious slander.

In this connexion we will notice another trait of injustice in this romance; the insinuation that the Presbyterians of the United States would fain prosecute Immersionists for their denial of infant baptism, if they dared. Let the reader note the deceitful form in which the charge is suggested. Theodosia, page 167. Mr. Courtney, the Immersionist schoolmaster says:

"I have it over the signatures of Roman Catholic, Episcopalian, Lutheran, Dutch Reformed, and Presbyterian writers, who, while they have been in full connexion with

those very establishments, all of which have (when they could,) been the most virulent and cruel *persecutors* of the Baptists," &c. On page 308, the same spokesman says:

"The most bitter and relentless persecution was directed especially against those who denied infant baptism. This has continued through every age. It has not been confined to the Roman Catholics. It has been practised by *all* the so-called churches *that received infant members*, (your own included,) whenever and wherever they have been able to obtain the power," &c. The speaker is addressing a family of Presbyterians in our country. And once more: on page 339, speaking of the persecution of Donatists in Africa in the 5th century, he says:

"From this day down to the present, in every country where Pædobaptists *have had the power*, our brethren have been the subjects of bitter and unrelenting persecution."

On the same page, this speaker claims the "Donatists, Novatianists, Cathari, Paulicians, Henricans, Petrobrussians, Mennonites, Allegences, Waldenses, &c.," as substantially of his church. Let us remark in passing, the evidence both of profound ignorance, and unprincipled recklessness of

assertion, contained in the last sentence. Every well informed student of Church History knows, that, of all the sects named; only the Petrobrussians, and Mennonites, with perhaps the Henricians, held any important peculiarity in common with the modern Immersionsts. The Waldenses always declare that they have practised infant baptism in all ages, as they do now. The Donatists and Novatians declared for themselves, that they only differed from the Catholic Christians of their own day, on the question of communion with certain Bishops whose ordination they considered as corrupt. It seems that this author of Theodosia, in his raking together of ready-made falsehoods at second and third hand, is too ignorant to know even how to spell the names of the sects about which he professes to be informed. Students of history are accustomed to hear of *Henricians*, and *Albigenses;* not of Henricans and Allegences. But this is by the way. It was seen that this writer does not dare to charge American Presbyterians with having actually persecuted Immersionists. But he obviously designs to make the impression on ignorant readers, that the only reason we have not done so is, that our free government has not

permitted us. Else why the reiterated assertion, that Pædobaptist churches, (*including our own*) have persecuted them *whenever and wherever they had the power?*

But now, what are the facts? The Protestant churches of the 16th and 17th centuries, unfortunately holding the doctrine of persecution, did, to a very limited extent, punish sectaries with civil pains; and among others, Anabaptists. Some Presbyterian churches in Europe were implicated in this guilt. But the Presbyterian church of America is in no closer sense a descendant of those European churches, or responsible for their misdeeds, than the Immersionists of America are descendants of the German Anabaptists and responsible for their frantic anarchy. Our church in America is an independent and original body. And from the very day of the first organization of its first Presbytery, it has been the consistent and uniform friend of the widest religious liberties to all equally. In the forming times of our Republic, the Presbyterian denomination led the van, in this glorious cause, and were the exemplars of that zeal with which Immersionists, (we mention it to their credit) asserted the same rights of religious liberty. We repeat; Presbyterians

led the van, in claiming the widest liberty for all others equally with themselves. Had this unscrupulous scribbler intended to speak the truth, he would have said: 'The most of the churches of the Reformation, including several of the Presbyterian, were guilty of persecuting sectaries, and among others, Immersionists, when they had the power: But in this country, the Presbyterian church has never had either the power or the wish to do so.' In one word, the Presbyterian church in the United States is at least, as clear from the desire to persecute Immersionists, as Immersionists are of the desire to persecute them. We denounce, therefore, with deserved indignation, this odious, false and wicked attempt, to create angry blood in Immersionists against Presbyterians. Heaven knows, there is heat enough already, while the question of baptism is debated in the fiery and reckless spirit of this novel. Its unholy purpose, it seems, demanded the inflaming of bad passions, in order to blind its readers to the wildness of its assertions and the flimsiness of its arguments.

It may be said, by the way, that the author puts nearly all his arguments and assertions on the Immersionist side, into the

mouth of a little schoolmaster, a Mr. Courtney, a man of infinite pertness, and rabid fluency. Courtney is evidently the *nom de guerre* of the author's self; and the tirades with which he overwhelms [at least the ears of] the *dramatis personæ*, are, as evidently, the staple of the harangues which the author (an Immersionist preacher, no doubt,) is in the habit of fulminating from his pulpit. We shall therefore, for convenience sake, employ the name of Courtney sometimes as representing the Immersionist advocate.

3. The folly and unfairness of such a mode of inculcating or defending what is supposed to be religious truth, can scarcely be too strongly represented. In the first place, a moment's consideration should have taught the author, that his selecting such a vehicle for his discussion was really a confession of weakness and defeat. Having failed to overthrow the sturdy Presbyterian champions in the fields of true and legitimate discussion, he is compelled to manufacture fictitious adversaries, in the pretended persons of Pastor Johnson, Dr. McNought, and elder Jones, who should be stupid and foolish enough to give this doughty *Don Quixote* a chance to claim the victory—If he wished to try conclusions

with a veritable Presbyterian champion, why did he not select a *bona fide* and *live* controversialist, in the person of some N. L. Rice, or Wm. L. McCalla? Ah; it was easier to gain a seeming victory over a man of straw! And this is not all: Conscious, as it seems, of the intrinsic weakness of his argument, the author must needs throw around it the factitious and illegitimate interest of a love-story. He did not believe, it seems, that his principles were important and interesting enough, to make Christian people read an honest and straightforward discussion of them for its own sake: he must needs sugar the nauseous dose, to make it go down. And then, one of his foremost champions forsooth, is a young, pretty and ingenuous girl, who is painted as attractively as the author's bungling hand knew how; in order to gain the unfair advantage of the feelings of readers for youth, beauty and sex. Sophistries from the mouth of a bearded man would be handled as they deserved; but when they drop from the pretty mouth of a pretty woman, gallantry forbids our testing them too narrowly! So that the author, afraid to meet *men*, and *as a man*, skulks behind the petticoats of his heroine.

And indeed; what is the intrinsic absurdi-

ty of sending Christian people to hunt for *truth* (and that sacred truth,) in a *work of fiction?* It is an insult to the understandings of readers; and a disgrace to the denomination which is judged to need such a mode of defence. No seeming triumph gained over an imaginary antagonist can prove any thing; for, as the same author constructed both his adversary's argument and his own, of course he would make the victory fall on his side. Æsop tells us, in one of his fables, how the man and the lion were once, during a truce in their warfare, amicably walking out together to take the air. They passed a picture where a lion was represented as bound, and crouching under the cudgel of a man. The man says to his lion friend: "You see there the superiority of our race to yours." "Nay," quoth the lion, "it is because a *man* was the painter. If a *lion* had held the brush, the parties would have been in a rather different position." Let the reader make the application.

It is said indeed, that Immersionists justify the circulation of the work by saying, that though there is a fictitious plot to make the book readable, all is fair, because the arguments put into the mouths of the Pres-

byterian characters are the standard arguments which we use when defending ourselves, and that they are fairly stated. But we beg leave to dispute both facts. According to all fair forensic rules, our mere word, repudiating those arguments as fair and full statements of our side, entitles us to arrest a debate conducted on such a plan. When plaintiff and defendant come into court, each party has a sovereign discretion in selecting his own advocate. If the defendant says that the counsel who has volunteered in his cause is not the man of his choice; and that, instead of representing him fairly, he is betraying him, this is enough. It is only necessary for the defendant to say that *he considers* this volunteer-advocate as unfaithful; it is not necessary for him to prove him such. He is entitled to make his own selection of a defender. So, we Presbyterians now and hereby notify Messrs. Graves, Marks & Co., and Messrs. Sheldon, Blakeman & Co., and all Immersionist preachers, colporteurs, members and proselyters, in these United States and the British Provinces, and wherever the far famed Theodosia may be running, that we do not consider, and never have considered the fair water-nymph (who was

a full blooded Immersionist before she began the investigation) nor the Presbyterian elder, Uncle Jones, (who was evidently *fishy*, i. e. indulging partial tendencies to go under the water, from the beginning,) nor poor, old parson Johnson, (who confesses he had never examined the subject much,) as suitable advocates of our cause; that we hereby repudiate them as such; and that we now lay our formal "injunction" on the progress of the discussion in such feeble and treacherous hands. Now, will our Immersionist neighbors arrest the debate; will they suspend the circulation of the *ex parte* and repudiated discussion, until the justice of our assertion can be tested; as they are forensically bound to do, in all fairness and honesty? We shall see. But if they are very anxious to prosecute this great cause of Immersionism *versus* Presbyterianism, at once; let them take the arguments of some real, actual Presbyterians, such as Dr. John H. Rice's *Irenicum*, Dr. John M. Mason's *Treatise on the Church of God*, or Dr. N. L. Rice's *Debate with Campbell;* print *the whole* of the Presbyterian argument in Presbyterian works, [and not a few disjointed scraps, falsely and treacherously torn from them] along with the best refutations they can

get; and lay these two pleas before the great jury of the Religious Public. This, if fairly done, might be fair.

The real motive and design of this advocacy of pretended truth by fiction, is this: It was hoped that the love-tale, the pictorial illustrations, the influence of sex and youth in the heroines favor, would make a multitude of ignorant people swallow the book, with its whole dose of misrepresentations, false issues, and unfounded assertions; who would never have taste, patience, or capacity, to read *any such reply as Presbyterians could condescend to write.* These readers would gulph down the low novel, but they would be very secure from the danger of reading a manly, straight-forward discussion of its pretended arguments and statements, unseasoned with fiction or demagogueism. The whole enterprise is a calculation on the gullibility of mankind; and it must be confessed, a calculation which was certain of realization to a large degree. But then it is also true, that the very element which ensures this partial success to the book, is the element also of its unfairness. It is successful *because* it is so unfair. So, in crimes of blacker character, the very treachery of the assault is oftentimes the

thing which makes resistance ineffectual. When an honorable enemy meets us fairly by daylight, and face to face, we have a chance of successful self-defence, according to that measure of prowess which God has given us. But if our adversary is wicked enough to turn assassin, and waylay our path, we are very free to confess that we are in his power; except so far as a good Providence interposes, the strength and skill of a Hercules will not avail.

Let it be distinctly understood then, that we neither hope nor expect to be attentively and dispassionately read by the persons for whom the shrewd managers of Theodosia Earnest have set their trap. People who are foolish enough to go to a work of *fiction* to learn sacred *truth*, are not likely to attend to a scholarly and solid discussion. (But it may be added that such people are hardly fit material to make Presbyterians of, at any rate.) We do not write for such. Our object is defensive. Learning that this novel is not only circulated among Immersionists, but obtruded very actively on Presbyterians, our purpose is, only to give our own people the means of knowing and exposing its true character, when they are assailed.

4. This book bears on its face another evidence of dishonesty. It comes forth to the world wholly without any responsible name. By this, we do not mean to complain of the fact that its authorship is not made known to the public; but that while it is anonymous in its parentage, no Editor, nor religious denomination, nor agency, stands god-father for it. A polemical work, especially one which so aggressively assaults other Christians, ought to have some responsible party to be held answerable for its statements. But a still stronger trait of dishonesty is the absence of all reference-marks to the books and other authorities cited, in a majority of cases. In some cases, such references are given; but in far more, authors are quoted in the most positive tone of assertion, and no clue is given, by chapter, section, or page, to the part of the works where the quotations may be verified. Are we to account for this peculiarity, which is as unscholarly as it is fraudulent, by the author's ignorance? That ignorance is manifest enough; but it is a very imperfect excuse; because mere common sense would have taught him that every writer, and especially one who, like Mr. Courtney, boasts frequently that it was not his wont to *assert*

things, but to *prove* them, is bound to give his readers the means of reading his citations for themselves, and judging of their relevancy and fidelity. The advocate who refuses to subject his witnesses to his opponent's cross-examination, is justly thrown out of court. Literary usage would justify us in summarily throwing out far the larger part of this author's citations, on this sole ground. We might justly say; "We do not listen to your witnesses; we count them as non-existent; because you have not given us chapter, or page, or section." But let not the reader suppose that we make these complaints, because there is any serious difficulty in rebutting or exploding the authorities of Theodosia and her schoolmaster. They are easily caught, notwithstanding their attempted skulking, as the reader will see.

Our plan in the remainder of this review will be, to take up, nearly at random, a part of the writer's false issues and sophistries, and expose them; and to show the treacherous use of authorities and testimonies cited by him, in a sufficient number of cases to enable the reader to estimate his trustworthiness. It is not our purpose to write a connected treatise on baptism. This

work is not now needed. The many sound and irrefragable arguments already constructed by our divines leave little to be desired, except their diligent circulation and study by our own people. Certainly, there is no peculiar force or originality in this pretentious work, to create an occasion for a new handling of the great question. The author advances nothing new. The familiar old grounds of discussion are brought in review. The only peculiarity is that the solid proofs on which Pædobaptists have usually and justly relied, are here obscured by a new batch of sophistries and misstatements. The only force which these sophistries have, is the impudent hardihood with which they are asserted.

5. As one specimen of a critical argument, let the reader take the following. On page 83, good old Mr. Johnson is represented as citing the well known and unanswerable argument against immersion that John the Baptist, (in Matt. iii: 11,) is represented as saying: "I indeed baptize you WITH water, unto repentance; but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear; he shall baptize you WITH the Holy Ghost, and with fire." Hence, argues old Mr. Johnson,

it was not immersion, but sprinkling or pouring; for one would not so naturally speak of immersing WITH water. Now we beg our readers to notice the dishonesty of this novel-writer. Instead of representing the Presbyterian pastor as going further, to substantiate this argument by the additions usually made to it by Pædobaptists when they employ it (additions in which its chief force consists,) the author distinctly indicates that the above contains the whole strength of the position of Presbyterians. Miss Theodosia and her lover seem to be for a moment somewhat posed by the argument; and just then the ubiquitous Mr. Courtney drops in. They tell him the substance of Mr. Johnson's words; (page 86,) adding that they do not well know how to get over it.

"Is that all?" asks Mr. Courtney?

"Yes;" (says Mr. Percy the lover,) "that is the substance of the argument."

Thus the author of the novel endeavors to produce the impression that this argument, in the hands of Presbyterians, is sustained solely by the criticism of the preposition in the phrase "baptism with water." He makes his *dramatis personæ* say; That is in substance, *all* of the argument. But

he knew perfectly well, (or else his assumption to debate baptism is impudent charlatanry,) that this is not all: that this is but the beginning of the statement of the case as Presbyterians put it. He took good care not to let his parties proceed to collate this passage with Acts i: 5, ii: 3 and 4, 17, 18, 38; x: 44; and xi: 15, 16. For then, it would have appeared that Mr. Johnson's interpretation of the baptism WITH water, and WITH the Holy Ghost must be correct; because the Holy Ghost is there said with immediate reference to John's language, again and again, to *fall on* the disciples, and to be *poured out*, and the fire with which they were baptized, *sat on* each of them like cloven tongues. But this by the way: Mr. Courtney thereupon expresses his amazement that Mr. Johnson should be so unfair as to take advantage of the English version, reveals to them the fact that the preposition translated WITH in Matt. ii: 11, is *en*, and appeals to Mr. Percy (a Greek scholar,) for the admitted fact, that *en* in classic Greek usually means IN, and not WITH; so that had not King James' naughty translators, to the perpetual anguish of all English and American Immersionists, obscured the sense, the passage should have

read: "I indeed baptize you IN water; . . . . he shall baptize you IN the Holy Ghost, and IN fire." He then proceeds to remark, (page 89,) that *en* is used two thousand, seven hundred and twenty times in the New Testament; that in about twenty-five hundred of these places, it does of necessity mean IN and not with; that in twenty other places, IN would better express the meaning of the original than WITH, while WITH (in the sense of instrument or material) is the necessary meaning in only forty places. Therefore argues Mr. Courtney; "The chances are as twenty-seven hundred to forty, that an argument based on the word '*with*' (where it stands for the Greek word '*en*') will lead to a false conclusion; and the chances are as twenty-seven hundred, to forty, that an argument based on '*in*,' as the real meaning of the word, will lead to a true conclusion."

Now, in the first place; what think you, good reader, of such a critical argument as this? Let us apply it fairly to another case: The Greek word *stauros* ('cross,') occurs twenty-eight times in the New Testament. In *nineteen* of these cases, it means unmistakeably, the *wooden crucifix*, on which Christ (or the two thieves) was executed.

In *six* places it is used with that sense which it bears in Luke xiv: 27. "And whosoever doth not bear his cross, and come after me, cannot be my disciple." Therefore, according to Mr. Courtney's marvellous rule of interpretation, the probabilities would be as nineteen to six, that in these passages our Saviour means: "Whosoever will not bear on his shoulder a wooden cross, and come after me, cannot be my disciple." But does not every reader in his senses know, that the word *stauros* must here be taken in the allied sense, not of a literal wooden cross, but of the burden of Christ's service, or some similar derived meaning? Does any body believe that there are nineteen chances to six, or that there is *one to a million*, that Christ here meant to announce the preposterous assertion, that the test of Christian character was to be carrying a log of wood on the back? Farther illustration of the ridiculous nature of this argument is not needed. The truth is, as every sensible person well understands, in every language, many words bear more than one sense, in different connexions, those senses being usually allied to each other in some way, though not the same: that any honest and sensible writer or

speaker nevertheless uses all such words in such a way that it may be certainly seen what meanings he intends them to bear in given connexions; and that when once it is discovered a given word may be grammatically used in a certain sense, its meaning in a particular place must be determined, not by inquiring which of its meanings most frequently occurs, but by inquiring only which suits this connexion most obviously. Every language in the world is built on these principles: every man in the world, (including even the remarkable Courtney) interprets language habitually on these principles, wherever prejudice does not blind him. And it does indeed look like the madness of despair, that Drs. Carson and Fuller, the British and American advocates whom Immersionists now chiefly follow, should stake their cause on the critical rule; *that when once a given sense has been established for a word of scripture, as its primary sense, that meaning and no other, must be gotten out of it wherever it occurs.* No man on earth interprets language on this rule: no man can carry it out consistently, in his understanding of the scriptures. And yet, Dr. Carson concedes no more than he is obliged, when he virtually admits that

this is the only theory of interpretation on which immersion can be proved to be the only baptism. For that point cannot be proved, unless it can be proved that *baptizo*, and *baptismos* in the scriptures always mean *dip* and dipping, and nothing else.

But in the second place, we request the reader to note that Mr. Courtney accuses good old Mr. Johnson of great unfairness in employing the English version, which represents John as speaking of baptism *with* water, *with* the Holy Ghost, and *with* fire, when the preposition in Greek is *en*. And the veracious pædagogue grounds his assertion of the evident error of this translation on this fact: that little Master Edwin Earnest informs them *en* is in classic Greek to be translated by '*in*' and not 'with.' Now, without pausing to prove that this is not universally true even in classic Greek, we would remind Mr. Courtney, that the Evangelists did not write in classic, but in Hebraistic Greek. They, being native Hebrews, employed many Greek words and constructions according to the usages of their own language. And moreover, in the Septuagint, the Greek translation made by Jews, of the Hebrew Scriptures, and in the New Testament, the preposition *en* is not

used by the rules of a classic Greek; but is also employed universally as the word to translate the Hebrew preposition (*béth.*) In Greek written by a Jew therefore, *en* may be expected to be found meaning any thing which *béth* might mean. These assertions *no scholar* will venture to dispute. The correspondence of the two prepositions in the usage of Jews writing Greek is expressly asserted by Gesenius, in his Hebrew Lex: which the reader may consult, if he chooses. It is not necessary to multiply authorities on so plain a case. But what does *béth* mean? Gesenius tells us, at the very outset of his article on the word, that the various significations of the preposition are grouped under three classes, 1st, *béth* meaning "*in*," 2nd, *béth* meaning '*at*' or '*by*,' 3d, *béth* meaning '*with*'—Consequently, the same may be true of *en*, when used by a Jew. Gesenius then, to illustrate what he means by the second use of '*béth*' refers to 1 Sam. xxix: 1. "The Israelites pitched (their camp) *béth hayin* which is in Jesreel." (Hayin means spring of water.) This the Septuagint translates; "The Israelites pitched *en Aendoor*: And the English version; "The Israelites pitched *by* a fountain which is in Jesreel." (Mr. Courtney, we

suppose, would have us believe that the Israelite army pitched their camp *in* the spring literally.) Gesenius also refers to Ezek. x: 15, where "*béth nehar Chebar*," is by him translated in Greek *en potamo*, and in English, "*By* the river Chebar." (So that when it is said John was baptizing *en Jordanee*, this language in a Jews's mouth might just as well mean *at* Jordan as *in* Jordan.) As an illustration of the 3d use, he gives among other places, Levit. viii: 32, "shall burn '*with*' fire;" which the Hebrew expresses by '*béth*' and the Septuagint by *en*. So that it is not true there is any probability arising from the usage of the preposition *en*, in Jewish hands, that the words "baptized *en to pneumati hagio, kai en puri*," mean baptized '*in*' rather than baptized '*with*.' But then also, to make it perfectly plain; the sacred writers show that they use *en* in the sense of baptizing '*with*' water, by using as an equivalent expression, the *ablative of instrument (hudate baptizo)* without any preposition at all. This is the case for instance, in Luke iii: 16; Acts i: 5; Acts xi: 16. Is not the indignant astonishment of the reader now rather turned on the schoolmaster, for thus hoodwinking his ignorant victims, than on Mr. Johnson, for

claiming the propriety of the English version? Or was the author ignorant of the well known distinction between classic and Hebraistic Greek? Then is he not a pretty man, to presume to discuss the language of the original scriptures, and to hurl his scurrilities broadcast, at all the wise and good men who have ventured to speak the truth about baptism?

But in the third place, when this prophecy of John; "There cometh one after me . . . . he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire," is seen in the light of its fulfilment in the book of Acts, at the places above cited, the meaning appears without the possibility of a doubt. There the Holy Ghost, which baptized them is "*poured out*," "*poured forth*," "*fell on them*, as on us at the beginning;" and the fire which baptized them "*sat on each of them* as it had been cloven tongues." No matter what the usage of the preposition might be, every man in his senses would see that the Holy Ghost was applied to their persons, and not their persons dipped into the Holy Ghost. But then, if John, and the Book of Acts quoting John speak of baptism *with* the Spirit, and *with* water in the same breath, the inference is unavoidable, that

the two baptisms were similar in their mode. Hence it was, that it suited the purpose of the author of Theodosia, not to have pastor Johnson quote the Acts in connexion with John the Baptist.

But the author could not avoid, in such a work, touching upon so well known a passage, and he therefore introduces it in the next chapter of his book, after he had, as he hoped, broken the force of the argument from it, by deceiving his readers concerning the usage and meaning of the preposition. On page 97, pastor Johnson is represented as employing the argument we have stated above; that the prediction concerning the baptism '*with*' the Holy Ghost, is seen in the second chapter of Acts, to be fulfilled by '*pouring out*' and '*shedding forth.*' Hence the inference that water baptism was by the same mode. And what, does the reader suppose is the Immersionist's reply? On page 98, Miss Theodosia explains the case thus:

"As Christ had told James and John that they should be immersed or overwhelmed by sufferings and sorrows, so now he tells all the disciples that they shall in a few days be immersed or overwhelmed by the influences of the Holy Spirit. That these

influences should cover, overpower, and swallow up their *minds*, as the water in baptism did their *bodies*. It is no more a literal baptism, than the baptism of suffering in Matthew. It is a metaphor; and the allusion is not to the *act* done in baptism, so much as to the result; that is, the *swallowing up* and *overwhelming* of their minds by the flood of life, and light, and joy, and heavenly influence which that day came upon their souls." On page 99, the fair, (yet most unfair) polemic strengthens her position by saying: "The Holy Spirit *cannot be* literally poured out or sprinkled out, nor could the disciples be literally immersed in him any more than they had already been; for He is, and always was, every where present and had always surrounded them on every side," &c.

The first thing to be noticed in this precious piece of exposition, is the completeness with which Theodosia tangles herself in her own net. She is very careful to show that the baptism '*in*' (as she will have it,) the Holy Ghost, is a thorough "*covering up*," a "swallowing up," of the Apostles. But, if the whole thing is merely a metaphor, and contains no "allusion to the *act* done in baptism," why need she care wheth-

er the application of the Holy Ghost was a pouring or a covering up? She knows she is not telling the truth, when she says there is no allusion to the mode; and hence her anxiety to make that mode a dipping as nearly as possible. The reasoning is as perfect a jewel of consistency as that of the old lady, who being charged with cracking a borrowed kettle, asserted first that the kettle was not cracked at all, and second that it was already cracked when she got it. See also Mr. Courtney, pp. 151, 152.

Next, is there not a spice of impiety and infidelity in asserting, in the teeth of the word of God, that there was no literal baptism at all, but only a 'mere metaphor?' If this baptism of the Holy Ghost was not a literal reality, then several things, oh Theodosia, inevitably follow; as for instance, that the predictions of John the Baptist and Christ were false; that the Apostles received no spiritual qualifications and authority for setting up the new dispensation, for legislating for the church, and for completing the canon of Scripture; which would leave thee, unhappy maid, as well as the rest of us undipped Christians, in rather a sorry case. No, you should have said, if you had been as thorough a dialectician as dipper; that

there was here no *material baptism;* although there *was a literal and real baptism* of spiritual influences. But then, inasmuch as material, water baptism is but a symbolical rite, in which the significancy depends wholly on the faithfulness with which it represents to the senses the spiritual reality; and inasmuch as the Holy Spirit was pleased to use the *very word*, *baptism*, of this literal and real, spiritual blessing; it is God's own definition of baptism as a pouring out of the element on the person baptized.

Again, when Miss Theodosia argues that it could not be a literal pouring, because the disciples were always equally surrounded by the omnipresent essence of God the Spirit, this fact, if it proves any thing, equally proves that it could not be an immersion. Why then did she trouble herself, seeing she acknowledges this in express words on page 99, to argue on page 88, that the figure was expressive of '*covering up?*' It would not be expressive of *mode* at all.

But on page 101, she proceeds to cap the climax of self-contradictions by introducing that famous passage, Rom. vi: 3, and claiming that the "burial with Christ by baptism," clearly proves immersion was the

mode of water baptism. Where now is the argument that a figurative reference can prove nothing as to mode, because it is "merely a metaphor?" The same pretty mouth which then blew hot, now blows cold. In Acts, where a *pouring down* of the influences of the Holy Ghost is expressly called a baptism, there can be no indication of the *mode* of water baptism. But in Romans, where Christians are figuratively said (for in this case the burial is only figurative) to be "buried with Christ *by baptism*, "(It is not said that the baptism was the burial, but only its sign,) there forsooth, the allusion to immersion is indisputable! Nay, verily, you shall not thus play fast and loose with us, at the convenience of your inconsistent theory. Fie on you, fair Sophist; Or, we should rather say; Fie on the author, for filling the lips of his lovely heroine with such a batch of absurdities.

As we have thus introduced Rom. vi: 3—we may as well call the reader's attention to a remark of the veracious pædagogue, Courtney at the bottom of page 154, "That the allusion here is to the act of immersion is so evident that none but the most determined and unreasonable cavillers pretend to deny it. I do not know of any single

commentator, whose opinions are entitled to any respect, who has ventured to differ in regard to this point from Luther and Calvin, and Doddridge and McKnight, and Chalmers—who all agree that the allusion is to the ancient form of baptism by immersion," &c. Now will not the reader be surprised, when he learns that it is *utterly false*, that Calvin in his commentary on this passage, "agrees" to any such thing? There is not one word in his whole remarks, which even implies such an admission; and their whole tenor strongly implies the contrary. Well, before we are done with Mr. Courtney, the reader will cease to be surprised at any thing which he asserts. But again: the learned pædagogue "does not know of any single commentator, whose opinions are entitled to any respect," that dares to differ from him on this point. We can inform him and his readers, that both Beza and Brown, of Haddington, Calvin and Henry, and Scott and Hodge, and Stuart and Haldane, the eight commentaries which we happened to have at hand, all differ from him; and expressly or tacitly discard his view of the passage. No doubt a little examination might increase the number to twenty. Shall we conclude that the opin-

ions of these eminent men "are entitled to no respect; or that they were not known to Mr. Courtney's ignorance. The public will judge. As Dr. Scott has been mentioned, it may be added that this well known and judicious writer, in a few simple lines effectually refutes the idea that the passage contains any reference to the mode of baptism. He shows that not water baptism, nor its mode, but that union to Christ which it signifies, is the thing upon which the Apostle reasons, in order to prove that he who truly partakes of Christ's justifying righteousness will also certainly partake of His deadness to sin, so that introducing a reference to the mode of baptism here really spoils the beauty of the Apostle's meaning. And then, if burial, the first of the three figures by which our spiritual baptism into Christ is here illustrated, must be interpreted as indicating the mode of water baptism, the other two figures ought, in all consistency to be so interpreted likewise, so as to make our water baptism not only like a burial, but like a planting, and like a crucifixion. We suggest to our Immersionist neighbors that they shall amend their sectarian psalmody, so as to sing not only about the "liquid grave," but also about

the "liquid soil," and the "liquid cross and nails."

6. Another specimen of false issues may be found in the manner in which the fishy Uncle Jones is made to state the argument against immersion from the baptism of the three thousand on the day of Pentecost; page 114, &c. (Of the false citations here, more hereafter.) The good Uncle suspends the question chiefly on these two points, that there was not water enough accessible, nor time enough for twelve men to immerse three thousand persons. To these two points Theodosia replies, that there was plenty of water; and proves it to her own satisfaction (by false quotations.) She then argues (page 116) that they were *not* all baptized the first day; and then proves that they *were* all baptized the first day by the Twelve; and that with ease. She must reconcile her own contradictions; we cannot. But the author takes excellent care not to let foolish Uncle Jones utter, what is the decisive point in the argument: that even if two hundred and fifty adults could be immersed in one afternoon, one by one; (This being the number which would have fallen to each of the Twelve,) one man could not immerse two hundred and fifty adults

in immediate succession, without being completely exhausted. Dipping is excessively hard work, to subject and operator; (Is not its popularity with self-righteous minds due to this?) and it is therefore mere trickery for the author to tell us that twenty persons can be immersed in fifteen minutes; (page 118,) when every Immersionist preacher knows, after a half-hour of such work, he is so thoroughly exhausted, that he must come out of the water.

The reasonableness of this assertion, that three thousand adults could find the means of an extemporary immersion in Jerusalem, in one afternoon, may be brought to a very practical test. Well watered as the City of Richmond is, with water-pipes, creeks, and wells; was there ever a "Baptizing" of any extent, among our modern Immersionists there, before baptisteries were expressly provided in their churches, that they were not compelled to adjourn to the noble James? Now if Richmond did not afford the means of giving an extempore dip to a company of twenty or thirty converts, is it even plausible to assert, that Jerusalem, in a most dry climate and season, could provide them for three thousand? It had no great river running just outside of its walls.

Outside, it was dry; (says Dr. Robinson,) so totally dry, that every besieging army which has surrounded it has had to bring its water from a distance. Within, it had sufficient rain water cisterns and open reservoirs, to supply the population with water for domestic purposes.

7. On the 207th and following pages of Theodosia, the reader will find a similar instance, affecting the argument for the far more important doctrine of infant baptism. Silly old Mr. Johnson is represented as advancing the instance of Christ's blessing infants, (recorded in Matt. xix: 13, 14; Mark x: 13, &c.; Luke xviii: 15. &c.,) in proof of their title to baptism. The courteous Courtney replies; page 208.

"I can't see *one word* about baptism in it."

"Oh," (says the pastor,) I do not say that baptism is *expressly named* in it; but sir, the *inference* is irresistible, that these children were brought *to be baptized*, and that the people were accustomed to bring their children for that purpose, and that Jesus commanded his disciples *never to forbid it*, as you Baptists have done, but to suffer the little children to come to him, and make a part of his visible church."

Thus the author deceitfully represents,

that *this* is the main argument which Presbyterians found on this passage; when he knew perfectly well, that the use which all intelligent Pædobaptists make of the passage is totally different, that they do not undertake to prove here that those infants were baptized by Christ; for indeed, they do not believe that Christian baptism was yet instituted. Of course any juggling chopper of logic can win an apparent victory, by thus putting into the mouth of imaginary adversary a false and foolish issue, and then refuting it. But what must be his impudent contempt for readers whom he expects to gull by so coarse a trick! The true manner in which Pædobaptists argue from this passage is this: That it is impious to suppose this blessing of Christ futile, or misplaced, or inoperative. So that, here is a total refutation given by Jesus Christ himself to the main rational objection of Immersionists against infant baptism. Their objection is, that it is absurd to administer a religious rite to a little senseless infant; because he is too young to profit by it. But here Jesus Christ administers a religious rite, which undoubtedly was profitable to infants. The objection is swept away. Here we see that the grace of God *can* benefit in-

fants. If they can partake *gospel blessings*, (as all must, who die in infancy, unless we are willing to teach infant damnation,) where is the absurdity of their partaking in gospel ordinances, should God so ordain?

Between pages 206, 207, of Theodosia, the publishers have introduced two wood cuts, which they doubtless thought very witty, exhibiting as they supposed, the absurdity of administering the water of baptism to a little squalling, frightened baby. Now we suggest that in their next edition, they substitute another subject for pictorial satire, which every one will perceive to be precisely as just and appropriate, as this burlesque cut of an infant baptism. It should represent the folly of the pious Jewish mothers, in bringing their little senseless babies to be blessed by our Redeemer, when they were too young to comprehend his language or acts: and should exhibit them frightened nearly into fits by the strange actions of the strange man, Jesus; and struggling back out of his arms into their mothers,' with their faces distorted with screams. We propose to Messrs. Graves, Marks & Co., to try their hands at this: then perhaps the world will compre-

hend whether their present caricatures are *witty* or *impious*.

But our main inference is more important still. Our Saviour defends his blessing them, by saying: "*For* of such is the kingdom of heaven." That is: He has blessed them *because* of such is the kingdom of heaven. To give to the words '*kingdom of heaven*' here, any other sense than that of Christ's Church, makes absolute nonsense: (as even the audacious Courtney does not venture to deny, when on page 209, he alludes in a meagre and partial manner to this argument.) Our Saviour, then, expressly calls infants a portion of his church. But as all admit that baptism is the initiatory ordinance by which members enter the church, infants who are church members are of course entitled to baptism. This argument the author takes good care not to state fairly. (We do it for him.) He does indeed endeavor to parry it, by saying that our Saviour does not say infants belong to his church, but that persons who would truly enter it must be *such as* infants; that is, must be lowly, harmless and amiable. And this interpretation he professes to support by the concessions of two Pædobap-

tists, Barnes and Olshausen. If Mr. Courtney had had the honesty to quote *all* that Mr. Barnes says, in his notes on Matt. xix: 13, 14, the reader would have seen that his remarks (ill judged and uncritical; as Barnes often is.) give the Immersionist no support. For Mr. Barnes also says substantially that the Jews had always been accustomed to bring their children to God by circumcision, and therefore it did not seem to them unnatural to bring them now to Christ. As for Olshausen, a German Rationalist, be he bepraised or not by injudicious Englishmen and Americans, we suspect we know much more about him than Mr. Courtney. Does Mr. Courtney say that he endorses him as correct and reliable? If he does not, he has no business to quote his interpretation as authority. If he does, then we tell him that he has endorsed a batch of theological errors, which would result justly in his expulsion from any respectable Immersionist church. When will this author learn, that Presbyterians do not hold themselves responsible for the false glosses of commentators, rationalistic or pious? We interpret the Scriptures for ourselves, [diligently using all helps, indeed] in the exercise of common sense and the fear of God. But

if quoting learned names is worth anything, we might quote great men, from Calvin down to Dr. Rudolph Stier, *a German*, too, and a more recent and learned expositor than Olshausen, who expressly contradict the latter. (See for instance, Stier's words of Jesus, edition of T. T. Clark, Edinburg, vol. 3, p. 21.)

But, away with all this: let the reader fairly consider the words of our Saviour under remark, for himself: he will see that they must be interpreted as we have done above. The plain reasons are as follows. When Christ says: "Of such are the kingdom," the word '*such*' must be fairly understood to mean the infants and persons resembling them. It does not exclude the former. For this is its common meaning in the gospels. When for instance Luke says, Acts xxii: 22, that the Jews, about to attempt St. Paul's life, "lifted up their voices and said; away with SUCH a fellow from the earth;" does any one suppose they meant, *not Paul, but other persons resembling Paul?* No, it is as though they had said; "Away with THIS fellow from the earth." Let the reader also examine Matt. ix: 8, xviii: 5; Mark vi: 2, ix: 37; Luke ix: 9, xiii: 2; John iv: 23, ix: 16; Acts xvi; 24, &c. It

is needless to multiply cases. So in our text; when Christ says: "Of *such* is the kingdom," his fair meaning is: "Of THESE (in part.) is the kingdom." That this was his meaning is proved, second by this: that the other idea, of presenting little ones as symbols or resemblances of what a Christian should be, is out of place here, because Matthew has a little before recorded Christ's use of that comparison. In Matt. xviii: 2, 4, "Jesus called a little child, and set him in the midst, and said; except ye be converted, and *become as little children*, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." That matter having been so lately recorded, it is unreasonable to suppose that the sacred writer meant no more by introducing a new and different incident. But third, and chiefly: If it is said that Christ put his hands on children and blessed them, only because their infantile state is a pretty illustration of what the Christian character should be, his act and language are turned into sheer nonsense. God often compares his Christians to *sheep* and sometimes to doves. Is this a reason why Christ should take up young lambs into his arms and bless them? Nothing but the utmost heedlessness, or most stubborn prejudice, could ever lead any one

to put such an argument in the Saviour's mouth. That they *aptly symbolized* true subjects of his kingdom is no reason whatever why they should be suffered to come to him and receive his divine blessing. That they were *themselves among* the subjects of his kingdom was a good reason why they should receive his blessing. But if some infants are members of his church, some infants should receive baptism, the acknowledged mark of membership.

8. We shall find another glaring instance of sophistry on pages 236, &c.; where Courtney is introduced as discussing with Mr. Johnson the argument from household baptisms in favor of the baptism of infants. After professing to convince himself, by a series of perversions of scripture, and hardy assertions without evidence, that none of the families baptized by the Apostles or their order happened to have infants in them, the irate pædagogue proceeds: (page 235, bottom.)

"But I am not willing to pass so readily from these passages. You are accustomed, Mr. Johnson, and so are all your ministers, to present these as proof texts for infant baptism. You will probably go and do it again: though I pray that God may give

you a better mind." (Very charitable, most meek master; to pray that we may not be given up to the enormous wickedness of saying that God's word means a given thing, after your infallibility has pronounced that it does not!) "They stand as proof texts in your 'Confession of Faith;' and yet in truth, neither they nor you *have ever believed them to be such*, or else you are more inconsistent in your conduct than sensible men are often found to be." (Oh courteous Courtney!)

He then proceeds to say that, if these instances of household baptism were believed by us to prove any thing, we should also baptize all the domestics and adult children, slaves and even wives, on the faith of the father. As we "do not dare" to do this; it shows that even we do not truly find any evidence here for infant baptism.

Now our first remark on this angry demonstration is: that it proceeds on this postulate: That no man is to be supposed to be sincerely convinced of a principle, except he acts it out consistently? That is; partial inconsistency with one's own principles sincerely held, is never seen among sensible men! Well, by this way of arguing, we shall prove that the Courtney's

"pure mind" has never truly seen or felt any evidence for the propositions, that railing, false witness, and malignity towards brethren, are sins. For he is indubitably found indulging pretty freely in all three practices in these pages. Again: we shall prove that Immersionists usually "have never believed" what they themselves say, when they teach that dipping a believer is the only valid baptism. For if they really believed it, consistency would require them to hold that nobody but Immersionists are church members, that consequently, there are no churches except theirs; and that consequently Pædobaptist ministers are no ministers at all; and their preaching is nothing but impudent presumption. Whereas in fact, Immersionists usually treat Pædobaptist churches practically as true churches, everywhere except at the Lord's Table; and are usually very glad to have Presbyterian ministers preach for them. in seasons of revival. Why, oh consistent Courtney, is not the one argument as good as the other?

But our second remark is: that according to the Jewish institution of circumcising households, no kind of servants, domestics, or retainers were allowed to be circumcised

upon the faith of their masters, except literal *slaves belonging* to the masters. See Exodus xii: 44, 45. Now, as we suppose the Abrahamic institution to be still substantially in force, none but slaves could by any construction, even the loosest, be embraced in "the household." The objection, therefore, applies to none but Pædobaptist slaveholders in these Southern States; a very small corner of Pædobaptist christendom. In every other part of the world, the incautious Courtney would find his notable demonstration worthless. But now if Pædobaptism is a sound doctrine all over christendom except among American slaveholders, we pray does the inconsistency of that little fragment make it unsound to all the world? As to the case of the wife, whom Mr. Courtney thinks, we ought to baptize, though unbelieving, on the faith of the husband, we remark that women, under the Abrahamic covenant, were not circumcised at all. But more: the Jews *could* not lawfully have a wife who was not also a member of the visible church; for he was not allowed to marry any other.—See Nehemiah xxiii: 23—27. In the institution from which we suppose "household baptisms" arose, such a case

as Mr. Courtney imagines could not arise; and, therefore, the Apostles naturally would not baptize the unbelieving wife on the faith of the husband, even though they baptize the children.

Once more; the polemical pædagogue studiously keeps out of view the fact, that Presbyterians usually show from the Scriptures that in every case of "household baptism," it was the *oikos* which was baptized on the faith of the father, and not the *oikia*; the family proper, and not the household! And we prove, by unmistakeable usage, New Testament, and classic, that the Greek writers of that age, usually made the distinction in the use of the two words. The *oikos*, in its literal sense was the *dwelling proper* of the husband, wife, and offspring; and in its derived, or figurative sense, it was the family strictly; that is, the children. The *oikia* was the *premises* or *curtilage* (including outhouses, barn, stables,) in its literal sense, and hence, in its figurative sense, embraced both children and dependents. That the English version does not make this distinction apparent, is no fault of ours.—Now, the Holy Spirit has not said that any *oikia* was baptized in the New Testament

on the faith of its head; but it has said that the *oikos* was. This is the reason of the conduct which the indignant Courtney considers so inconsistent in us Presbyterians. "Ah, but," he urges: "You don't baptize the adult children on the faith of the father!" and yet they belong to the *oikos*, as well as the *oikia*. Well, perhaps if patriarchal government still subsisted in the world, as it did among the Hebrews; so that the pious father had the means of securing the use of the means of grace, and a religious life, from his adult children, we would baptize them also. But in a country like ours, where both custom and law make the adults social equals to their parents, we submit, they hardly form a part of the *oikos*, in the Abrahamic sense.—Presbyterians are not quite so easily caught, Oh, sapient schoolmaster! They have thought over these things before you were born.

9. We shall conclude this part of our review, by referring the reader to an admission made by the author's mouth piece, on page 292. By this time, the fishiness of Uncle Jones is developed into a positive aquatic propensity; he has pretty much made up his mind to go under the water—

but the church session to which he belongs, and his colleagues in the Presbyterian Faculty, have been remonstrating and arguing with him. His prompter (the ever prompt pædagogue,) is listening to his account of the conversation, and advising the proper replies to their arguments. Concerning the well known and irrefragable arguments that as children were embraced under the Abrahamic covenant, and as the Abrahamic covenant still subsists, children are of course, to be included, until a positive enactment is given from the Head of the Church excluding them; this reply is advised.—(p. 292.)

"I should have said to them further: Gentlemen, you call the Jewish *nation* the Church of God—and tell us that the Christian Church is the same under a different dispensation. But Christ calls the nation *the world* in opposition to his Church. The disciples to whom Christ spake, (John xv: 19.) were men in good and regular standing in the Jewish nation, which you call the Church. Yet Christ says: 'I have chosen you *out of the world;* and, therefore, the world, (that is the Jewish nation,) hateth you.' * * * The cases of Nicodemus and Paul are also cited, and the author pro-

ceeds: "The Jews needed conversion as much as any, before they could make any portion of the *Church* of God. This Church God set up for the *first* time when John began to preach. There were good men, pious, devoted men among the Jews, but they were not gathered into *a church*. The Jewish nation had some religious privileges; but it was not in the gospel sense *a church*."

We have quoted these repetitious statements at large, that the reader may see how fully and emphatically it is asserted that God had *no church* in the world, till the days of John Baptist. But before we proceed to the use which we intend to make of this fatal admission, let us sweep away the little cobweb of argument founded on our Saviour's words to his disciples: "I have chosen you *out of the world*." One remark accomplishes this—that the argument assumes the point in debate. If the Church of the New Testament is such that worldly—that is unconverted people cannot be in it, then it follows that Christ would not speak of choosing out of the world, one of its members. But to assume that Christ's Church is such, is the very thing which remains to be proved, by the exclusive advocate of "believer's baptism."—

Let us see how far this notable argument would cut. In Phil. iii: 18, Paul says: "For many walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ, whose end is destruction, whose god is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly (worldly) things." We rather think that, had Christ chosen to call one of these professors to true conversion, he would have "chosen them *out of the world.*" Yet they were also members already of the Phillipian Christian Society. Therefore, that society was not a Christian Church!—Ah! true enough it was *not* an Immersionist church.

Again,—according to Mr. Courtney and all his brethren, Peter and his friends were already in the Church (founded by John the Baptist,) when Christ first called them.—For it is very clear that if John's baptism of them is admitted not to be christian baptism, we are utterly without evidence that Peter was ever baptized at all, and then we should have Peter, in this very 16th chapter of John, partaking of the first Lord's Supper, administered by the hands of our Saviour himself, while Peter was still unimmersed; together with sundry

other consequences enormous and dreadfnl in the Courtney's eyes. He must hold, therefore, that Peter had gotten into the church "through the door," by the help of John and the Jordan, before that selection of him by Christ to which our Saviour refers. Why multiply instances, as we easily might do! In one word, does any body deny that, in true gospel churches there may usually be found worldly members; so that if God's grace should effectually call one of them out of his worldliness to genuine holiness, his conversion might provoke the carnal opposition of other unconverted members like himself? When God, by his grace, raised up Andrew Fuller, to preach the great truth in the Immersionist churches of Great Britain of which he was a member, that "the gospel is worthy of all acceptation;" did he not meet the hatred and opposition of worldly, Antinomian members of that denomination?—Therefore, Mr. Courtney should reason because there was worldliness in that denomination, to hate that holy man when following Christ's call, the English Immersionists were not a true church! This is the consistent Courtney's arguing, not ours.

A very zealous immersionist lady once

told us, that she witnessed a conversational discussion on infant baptism, in a stage-coach, between a distinguished Episcopal divine, and a famous Immersionist champion, (to whom we recognize the indebtedness of the author of Theodosia in this, and other lucky loans.) The Episcopalian advanced the usual argument from the substantial identity of the Abrahamic, with the New Testament church. The Immersionist replied by saying: "How then could our Lord say to Peter and his brethren, 'I have chosen you *out of the world?*'" "Whereupon," said our informant, "the Episcopalian was struck dumb!" We surmised in ourselves, that the reason was, not that the marvellous reply was unanswerable; but that politeness forbade its being dealt with as it deserved, and that, finding the unscrupulous character of his antagonist, he wisely concluded to discontinue the discussion. Similar politeness, of course, forbade us from exposing the nonsense of the argument to our fair friend; so that we left her in unconscious ignorance, supposing that it was as unanswerable to us, as to the Episcopal divine.

But this is by the way. We beg our readers to observe that this favorite Im-

mersionist advocate, the author of Theodosia, has found it necessary, *deliberately to deny the existence of any proper Church of God in the earth before the Christian era.* To the Jews, he says, there never was a Church. Israel was only a nation, not a church; and in Israel there was no proper church! Very well; we take it for granted that, had there been any other way to evade the inevitable result of our argument from the perpetuity of the Gospel covenant made with Abraham, the cautious Courtney would not have resorted to this desperate position. We accept it, therefore, as the implied (yet clear) admission of the highest Immersionist authorities, that either infant baptism is right, or it must be denied that God had any church among the Jews.

Now then, let us see how directly Immersionism has to fly into the teeth of the express word of God. The reader of the English Bible sees that God's professed people are called in the Old Testament, "*the congregation* of the Lord." Let him see for instance, how the word is used in Nehemiah xiii: 1—Psalms xxii; 22—Joel ii: 16.—In these places, and many others, the Septuagint Greek version renders it *church*

(*eklesia.*) Is not this evidence enough that the words are the same; that the *Lord's congregation* of the Old Testament was the *Lord's church?* But again,—in Acts vii: 38, the inspired Stephen says, speaking of Moses: "This is he that was in *the church* in the wilderness," &c. In Hebrews ii: 12, the Apostle represents David as saying, (in the Psalm xxii: 22,) "In the *midst of the church* will I sing praise unto Thee." True, if the English reader will turn to the English version of that Psalm, he will find the word *congregation.* But we presume the Apostle knew what David meant as well, at least. as the English translators. Again,—Hebrews iii: 5—6, it is said: "And Moses verily was faithful in all his house, as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after; but Christ as a Son, over his own house, whose house are we if we ho'd fast the confidence." Judicious commentators, for instance, Dr. Gill, the great Immersiouist, agree that the *house* means the *church*, in which Moses was a servant, and Christ a Prince, (being the King's Son.) and *to this house we belong*, says the Apostle, if we do not apostatize. So then, it seems there was an Old Testament church; and it is

that which New Testament believers join! Once more; let the reader examine Rom. xiv: 17—24, and he will find the Apostle presenting these ideas in substance to Gentile believers: the *one common church* of both dispensations is a good olive tree; from which the rejected Jews were broken off, for their unbelief, when they rejected and crucified Christ, and into which Gentiles were engrafted. But at length Israel will be brought into the church again; and this will be a re-engrafting of them (at the approach of the millennium) into "their own olive tree."

But perhaps the author of Theodosia may avail himself of the plea, (which he so strenuously condemned, when trying to make *baptizo* mean dip only;) that the same word may have more than one meaning; so Stephen's calling Israel the "church in the wilderness," may not necessarily prove that it was properly a church in the Bible sense. Very well: by what attributes, or marks. can a society be identified as *a church of God?* Is a church a body which is separated by profession from the world, to the service of God? So was Israel. Is a church a body marked by the use of divinely appointed Sacraments! So

was Israel. It had its circumcision and passover. Is a church a body organized under a *ministry?* So was Israel. Does a church statedly maintain the worship of God? So did Israel. Is a church a school in which the teaching of God's *revealed word* is maintained from age to age? So was Israel. See Rom. iii: 2. Yea more: the society founded in the family of Abraham enjoyed that most peculiar privilege of the Gospel church, *the preaching of the Gospel.* St. Paul tells us (Gal. iii: 8.) that "the Scripture preached before the Gospel unto Abraham." Yea, our Saviour himself says: "Your Father Abraham rejoiced to see my day; and *he saw it and was glad.*" John viii: 56. So that Israel has every mark of a true church. Yea, of being *the true Gospel church*, except this: it did not exclude infants. It would not stickle for "believer's baptism," (or circumcision.) There, Mr. Courtney, is the fatal thing which unchurches it, in your eyes! But whether this state of facts proves that Israel was no church, or that you are wrong in your dogma, the intelligent reader may decide.

But upon what age of the world have we fallen, that there should be occasion for a

Christian to set again about proving that God had a church under the old Dispensation? We seem to ourselves to have gone back three hundred years, to some of those "times of ignorance which God winked at," when the Reformers were fast emerging from the mists of Popery, and had all the wildness and fanaticism of Anabaptism to resist.

10. We now proceed to another part of the work which we proposed to ourselves, for the righteous chastisement of this wicked publication. We have given our readers specimens enough of its false and dishonest arguing. We have shown them in a number of instances, that the seeming triumph of its logic is procured by the low artifices of raising false issues, and assuming the point in debate. So we might extend our refutations and exposures throughout the book, till the reader was wearied and disgusted even to nausea, with the exhibition of such unvarying sophistry. We pause in this series of exposures, not because material is wanting; but because we believe that every reasonable reader is sufficiently satisfied of the recklessness of the author, and of his utter unworthiness to be trusted.

We shall now exhibit in a number of in-

stances, selected very much at random, the unprincipled manner in which historical facts, and literary authorities are misrepresented, or actually falsified, by the author. And here again; we would assure our reader that we do not expose the half of the instances which admit and deserve such exposure. We spare him the weariness and disgust of such an exhibition. Our purpose is only to give instances enough to enable him to judge, for himself, the trustworthiness of the book: and to see that its facts are usually as false as its arguments. Let us, in this connexion remind the reader of the circumstance already noted, that this falsifyer of history has endeavored to cover up his tracks by omitting, in a majority of cases, all reference to editions, chapters, and pages of the authors he professes to quote. But it has been in vain.

Once more; a word must be premised concerning the favorite trick of this author; the quoting of Pædobaptist commentaries and doctors on his side of the question.—He claims sweeping admissions, as having been made, not only by those crotchety and fantastic (though learned) minds, whose soundness of judgment all orthodox Christians are compelled utterly to distrust, on all

subjects as well as on baptism, such as McKnight, Campbell, Olshausen, Barnes; but also from Luther, Calvin, Chalmers, Miller, &c., Some he cites as giving up this proof-text, and some as surrendering that. Some, he says, admit that *baptizo* means primarily nothing but dip; and some that dipping was the undoubted mode of the ancient church. Now concerning all these citations (omitting for the present misrepresentations,) we have three remarks to offer.—First; were not all these men steady Pædobaptists in their practices, notwithstanding these pretended admissions? Were they not men of undoubted intelligence and holiness? Then every fair reader will take it for granted that they at least supposed they saw consistent and solid grounds for not being Immersionists, although this fiery slanderer declares it impossible.—Now, good reader, we suggest, that *perhaps* it is at least as probable these great men, whose undoubted wisdom, learning, and holiness, all the world venerates, were right, as that this unscrupulous sophist and defamer, already detected in so many breaches of confidence, is just in charging them with conscious inconsistency. Second, Presbyterians do not pin their faith to the

notions of any uninspired teacher, however good. But if human authorities were to decide the question, it would be perfectly easy for us to show a still greater number of learned men, who contradict Theodosia's authorities. But we shall not insult the understandings of Protestant readers to offering such a settlement. It is amusing to see how, when Pædobaptist doctors seem to say anything that favors immersion, this author is almost ready to say: "It is the voice of a God and not of a man;" but if they oppose immersion, at once they are scoundrels and hypocrites, who practise all the arts of priestcraft, and hoodwink innocent souls to their ruin.

But third; We submit it: Is it fair to quote and apply a concession of a Pædobaptist thus? These commentators honestly believe that *baptizo*, whatever may have been its primary, classical meaning, has come to have a generic, sacramental meaning, in the New Testament; that baptism, in that sense is any symbolic washing with water, of a proper subject, by a proper administrator. in the name of the Trinity; that according to the teachings of God's word, in such a symbolic sacrament, the more or less water, and the mode in which

it is applied to the body, or the body to it, *cannot* be of importance; and that God has signified the sufficiency of sprinkling or pouring as a sacrament, by *always* representing the blood of Christ and the grace of the Holy Spirit, (the two things which the water represents) as poured, shed, or sprinkled down. Now a commentator holding these views might admit (what we and the *great* majority of Pædobaptists utterly deny.) that many or all of the baptisms of the New Testament were by immersion, and yet consistently deny that immersion is necessary or obligatory on us. Now *is it fair* to quote such authors as giving up the point to the Immersionists?

Old Wall, (author of a Treatise on Infant Baptism ) who is himself so abused by the cunning Courtney, gives us an amusing instance to show that the trick of mis-quoting Pædobaptists by Immersionists is not a new one in our day. Speaking of a learned and accurate Pædobaptist writer, Mr. Walker, he says:

"Here by the way, I cannot but take notice how much trouble such an adventurous author as this *Danvers* (an Immersionist.) is able to give to such a careful and exact answerer as Mr. *Walker*. Dan-

vers does in this place deal with above twenty other writers after the same rate as he does with the two I have mentioned, viz: *Scapula*, *Stephanus*, *Pasor*, *Vossius*, *Leigh*, *Casaubon*, *Beza*, *Chamier*, *Hammond*, *Cajetan*, *Musculus*, *Piscator*, *Calvin*, *Keckerman*, *Diodat*, *Grotius*, *Davenant*, *Silenus*, Dr. *Cave*, *Wiel*, *Strabo*, and Archbishop *Tillotson*. He does in the space of twelve pages, quote all these in such words as if they had made dipping to be of the essence of baptism. Mr. Walker shows that he has abused every one of 'em; by affixing to some of 'em words that they never said, by adding to others, by altering and mistranslating others, and by curtailing the words of the rest. But what a Trouble is this, to go upon such a man's errand from Book to Book, search the chapters, (which he commonly names wrong,) recite the words first as he quotes 'em, and then as they really are in the Book! This cost Mr. Walker three large chapters. And what would it have been to answer the whole book, which is all of a piece? This is the book which is so much handed about among the Anti-pædobaptists of England."—Wall's History of Infant

Baptism, vol. 2, p. 371, 2nd London Edition of A. D., 1720.

But to our task. On p. 136. The divers "baptisms" of the Pharisees when they come from market, and of the cups, pots, brazen vessels, and of tables, (Mark vii: 3—4,) are under discussion. (The word rendered "*washings*"' is in the original "*baptisms*.") Even the fishy Uncle Jones seems to think these baptisms squint awfully towards *pouring*. But the crafty Courtney comes to the rescue, with a pretended extract from a famous Rabbi Maimonides (without means of verifying it by the name of his work, or volume, chapter, or page,) who asserts that the Pharisees always *dipped* themselves, their vessels, and their couches on such occasions.

"That will indeed remove every shadow of doubt," said the Professor; "but have you indeed such testimony?"

"Certainly we have," replies the convenient Courtney; "There was a very learned Jew, who wrote a very elaborate commentary on the Jewish customs and traditions. Dr. Adam Clarke, the great commentator, recognizes his authority, and calls him" (where; in what volume, chapter, page? Oh, cunning Courtney!) "the

great expounder of the Jewish Law; and as he comes thus 'properly vouched for,' I trust his evidence will not be disputed.—This learned and eminent Rabbi, commonly called Rabbi Maimonides, says, in his commentary, 'Every vessel of wood, as a table or bed, receives defilement, and these were washed *by covering in water*, and very nice and particular they were,' he adds, 'that they might *be covered all over*,'" &c., &c.

Now good reader. does not this paragraph make the impression that "Dr. Adam Clarke the great commentator," (not considered sound by any good scholars, by the way,) "recognizes the authority" of Maimonides in connexion with this subject?—Did not the author intend it to make this impression? He does not *say* so, sly fellow; for then he might be caught. Now we turn to Dr. Adam Clarke's commentary on Mark vii 3—4; read the whole of it, and *find not one word of Maimonides, or any Jewish Rabbi, as teaching that these Pharisees and their couches were dipped, and see that Clarke roundly asserts all through, that these baptisms were not, and could not be, by immersion!*—Now after such an imposture has been attempted on us as this; we cannot believe that the citation from Maimonides is true,

on this author's 'say-so.' We do not believe that the author of Theodosia ever saw these statements in the book of Maimonides or in any translation even, that he ever saw the place in Adam Clarke where he "properly vouches for him," that he could tell us where to look for the citation from either Clarke or Maimonides, or that he has ever had any means of knowing personally whether these statements were ever uttered as he quotes them by the two writers. We will tell the author, and his Immersionist friends who and what Maimonides was; and they will then see on what ground we think so.

Certain it is, Clarke makes no admission of Maimonides' authority at the place in question. The nearest approach which we can find to it is the following; Clarke, in a sort of Bibliographical work, entitled "Succession of Sacred Literature," p. 56, describes a copy of the *Mischna*, or text of the Babylonish Talmud, published at Amsterdam in 1698, with the whole comments of Maimonides and Bartenora thereon. And concerning *this collection*, he says: "This is a very beautiful and correct work, necessary to the library of every biblical critic and divine. He who has it need be soli-

citous for nothing more on this subject."—Does this vouch for the correctness of Maimonides' statements, or the correctness with which they are edited and translated?

In the next place, Maimonides, a Spanish Jew by birth was born in the year of our Lord 1131. (Did not the reader suppose that he was almost a cotemporary with Christ?) The Babylonian Talmud, on which he wrote both annotations and an abridgement, was not compiled till the year 500 or after. Now is *this* an authority to be set up against God's word, as to Jewish usages at the Christian era? If the Jews had departed so widely from Sacred writ in their traditions, in the four hundred years between the prophets and Christ; how much more widely may they not have departed in the next five hundred years of growing apostacy and superstition? But a word as to these baptisms of the Pharisees, when returning from the markets; and of cups, pots, couches!—This author claims Old Testament evidence for the dipping of them, by referring to the numerous ceremonial washings enjoined, for instance in Levit. xv: "He shall bathe in water." But the word "*bathe*" is always "*rahatz*," which *does not mean dip*, as all

know; and the preposition is '*beth*,' which may as justly be rendered "wash *with* water." Again; Levit. xi; 32, is referred to, where it is provided that when the dead body of an unclean animal falls on a garment, brazen vessel, &c., "it shall be put into water." But this is evidently a *soaking*, and not a mere dipping. But, that these daily immersions of whole persons and bulky furniture could not be practised in a country of few fountains and running streams, is plain from this. When water which had come in contact with anything unclean stood at all in a vessel, the vessel itself became unclean, and must be broken. Levit. xi: 34—36. Nothing except a *flowing fountain*, or pit in which was *much water*, could submit to the immersion of an unclean object, without becoming itself unclean, with all its water. Hence pouring must have been the customary mode, for the lesser daily uncleanesses, at least.—And of this we have Bible proof. See 2 Kings iii: 11.—"Here is Elisha the son of Shaphat, *which poured water on the hands of Elijah*." The reference is to the time when Elisha, as a pupil of Elijah, ministered to him in his religious purifications. In John ii: 6, we are told; at the wedding at Ca-

na, there stood "six water pots of stone, after the manner of the purifying of the Jews, containing two or three firkins apeice." These pots the women were accustomed to carry on their heads. They held two or three firkins, (*metretas*) and were too small to admit an adult's whole body. But they were provided for the Jews' customary ceremonial baptisms; that is, to afford a sufficient supply of water, not ceremonially polluted by the immersion of any unclean thing, to be poured upon the hands of the household and the guests. As the company had already assembled and the eating begun, the water had already been thus used; hence (John ii: 7.) Jesus had to cause the jars to be filled with water.

It would seem therefore that (supposing Maimonides does assert the daily purifications of the Jews were by dipping the whole body, which we feel not a particle of interest in denying;) these apostate, superstitious Jews, in the course of five or eleven hundred years after Christ, had "improved upon" the Bible institutions concerning their ceremonial baptisms, very much as Immersionists have done in the superstitious ages of Romanism, and in these last

(enlightened?) ages. The *Hydromania* has been a growing disease.

We now request the reader to accompany us to Theodosia's 115th page: where it is desired to force Pædobaptist authority to prove that there was plenty of water about Jerusalem at harvest, to immerse three thousand adults at once. Dr. Edward Robinson, an eminent living scholar, Professor in the Presbyterian (New School) Seminary in New York is quoted. He made a tour of the holy regions with the express view of illustrating biblical antiquities, and published his observations in three valuable volumes. In vol. 1, p. 480—586, we find the passages from which the sharp schoolmaster quotes as follows:

"Dr. Robinson, one of these travellers, speaks of 'immense cisterns now, and anciently, existing within the area of the Temple, supplied partly from rain water, and partly by the aqueduct;' and tells us also that 'almost every private house had a cistern in it,'—p. 480. Speaking of the reservoirs, he says, p. 483, 'with such reservoirs, Jerusalem was abundantly supplied, to say nothing of the immense pools of Solomon beyond Bethlehem, which were

no doubt constructed for the benefit of the Holy City.'

"'There are,' he says, 'on the north side of the city, outside the walls, two very large reservoirs, one of which is over three hundred feet long, and more than two hundred feet wide, and the other nearly six hundred feet long by over two hundred and fifty feet wide;' and besides these he mentions the pool of Siloam, and two others as being without the walls. Within the walls he mentions 'the pool of Bathsheba,' 'the pool of Hezekiah,' and 'the pool of Bethezda.' The pool of Hezekiah he says was about two hundred and forty feet long by about one hundred and forty-four feet broad; the pool of Bethesda three hundred and sixty feet long by one hundred and thirty wide; and besides these he mentions an aqueduct and numerous other fountains." So far the Pædagogue quoting Dr. Robinson.

The first fact, which damages the utility of this citation, and the honesty of the author in making it, is this; that while the scraps he has picked out of Dr. Robinson's Researches, over a space of thirty-six pages, may all be found there; they were picked out of the very midst of other state-

ments; such as these; that the "numerous other fountains" are either, veins of water at the bottom of very deep wells, (as the fountain En Rogel,) or small springs either walled in, or arched over, the thin streams of water flowing from which are carefully conducted into some subterranean receptacle; and that those cisterns in almost every private house, were just as available for purposes of immersion as a common well in Virginia. Mr. Robinson says, (p. 480—481.) "The cisterns have usually merely a round opening at the top, sometimes built up with stone work above, and furnished with a curb and a wheel for the bucket; so that they have externally much the appearance of an ordinary well." * * * * "In this manner most of the larger houses and public buildings are supplied." * * * * "Most of these cisterns have undoubtedly come down from ancient times; and their immense extent furnishes a full solution as to the supply of water for the city." Now how could this writer select his scraps, designed to make Dr. Robinson seem to say that there were abundant means at Jerusalem for immersing the three thousand, without seeing these statements which show that

his use of them is deceptive? His is not a sin of ignorance.

The second fact which we wish the reader to take along is this; that Dr. Robinson in another work, tenfold more known than his Researches in Palestine, and quoted by this very Courtney, his Lexicon of the New Testament Greek, does explicitly and directly give in his testimony as to the mode in which the Pentecostal baptisms must have been performed. This is appended to his definition of the word *baptizo*. See Harper's Edition of 1850. When the schoolmaster examined Dr. Robinson to extract that testimony as to the meaning of the word, with which he twits us he must have seen this passage. If then he had wished to tell his readers honestly, what Dr. Robinson thought of the matter, why did he not give this statement? We will do it for him. Dr. R. says *baptizo* in New Testament means, '*ablution* or *effusion*.'—b.) "In Acts ii; 41, three thousand persons are said to have been baptized at Jerusalem apparently in one day at the season of Pentecost in June; and in Acts iv: 4, the same rite is necessarily implied in respect to five thousand more. Against the idea of

full *immersion* in these cases there lies a difficulty, apparently insuperable, in the scarcity of water. There is in summer no running stream in the vicinity of Jerusalem, except the mere rill of Siloam a few rods in length; aud the city is and was supplied with water from its cisterns and public reservoirs. See Bibl. Researches in Palest. I, p. 479—516. From neither of these sources could a supply have been well obtained for the immersion of eight thousand persons. The same scarcity of water forbade the use of private baths as a general custom; and thus also further precludes the idea of *bathing* in the passages referred to in letter a,) (Luke xi: 38, Mark vii: 2, 4, 8.) c.) In the earliest Latin versions of the New Testament as for example the *Itala*, which Augustine regarded as the best of all (de Doctr. Christ, ii: 15) and which goes back apparently to the second century and to usage connected with the apostolic age, the Greek verb *baptizo* is uniformly given in the Latin form *baptizo*, and is never translated by *immergo* or any like word; showing that there was something in the rite of baptism to which the latter did not correspond. See Blanchini. *Evangeliarium Quadruplex*, etc. Rom. 1749. d.) The

baptismal fonts still found among the ruins of the most ancient Greek churches in Palestine, as at Tekoa and Gophna, and going back apparently to very early times, are not large enough to admit of the baptism of adult persons by immersion; and were obviously never intended for that use. See Bibl. Res. in Palest. II., p. 182, III., p. 78." Thus Dr. Robinson speaks for himself.

We pass now to another perverted witness on the subject of infant baptism. On pages 323, 324 of Theodosia, Courtney, the corruptor of facts, cites Dr. Mosheim's Church History as follows:

"Dr. Mosheim, who is universally known and regarded as high Pædobaptist authority, says, in his Ecclesiastical History of the first century; 'No *persons* were admitted to baptism but such as had been previously instructed into the principal points of Christianity, and *had also given satisfactory proof of pious dispositions* and upright intentions.' Of the second century he says: 'The sacrament of baptism was, during this century, administered publicly twice a year at the festivals of Easter and Whitsuntide. The persons to be baptized, after they had repeated the creed, confessed and renounced

their sins, particularly the devil and his pompous allurements, were immersed under water, and received into Christ's kingdom by a solemn invocation.' Of course they were not unconscious infants."

Thus far the smart schoolmaster. His obvious intention is to represent Dr. Mosheim as explicitly implying that infants were excluded from baptism by the current usage of the first and second centuries. But how would the learned German be amazed to hear himself quoted for such an assertion. We shall now place over against Mr. Courtney's pretended citation, the whole passage as it is translated by Dr. Murdock, far the most accurate of his translators, and printed in Murdock's Mosheim, Harper's edition, 1844, page 137. Even the very passage which the Immersionists thus pervert will then be found to contain sufficient evidence, without looking farther into Mosheim's opinions, that this learned antiquary was speaking, not of Christian infants, but of accessions from Judaism and Paganism.

"§. 13. Twice a year, namely, at Easter and Whitsuntide, (*Paschatis et Pentecostis diebus.*) *baptism* was publicly administered by the *Bishop*, or by the *presbyters* acting

by his command and authority. The candidates for it were immersed wholly in water, with invocation of the sacred Trinity, according to the Saviour's precept, after they had repeated what they called the *breed (Symbolum,)* and had renounced all their sins and transgressions, and especially the *devil* and his *pomp*. The baptized were signed with the cross, anointed, commended to God by prayer and imposition of hands, and finally directed to taste some milk and honey. The reasons for these ceremonies, must be sought in what has already been said about the causes of the ceremonies. Adults were to prepare their minds expressly, by prayers, fasting, and other devotional exercises, *Sponsors* or *Godfathers* were, as I apprehend, first employed for adults, and afterwards for children likewise."

Thus Mosheim himself indicates that when he spoke of candidates for baptism repeating the creed, renouncing the devil, etc., he intended only that these preliminaries were exacted of adults. That infants were baptized without them, he implies, and that intentionally, when he says; "*Adults* were to prepare their minds expressly, by prayers, fasting, and other devotional exercises." And Godfathers were introduced

also: at first for adults; because at first the pious parents of the children of the church stood for their own infants, and no other infants were admitted to baptism; but by degrees, as superstition grew, these sponsors were also admitted to stand for the infants of those out of the church. The above passage which we have faithfully quoted from Mosheim also presents the reader with a specimen of the manner in which the German antiquaries usually state the testimony of the 2nd and 3d centuries concerning the mode of baptism; as being by a trine immersion, accompanied with several superstitious rites of crossing, laying on hands, tasting honey, milk and salt, and putting on a white garment. There are two reasons why we do not consider this testimony of any importance. First, the New Testament mode was evidently different; and we do not feel bound by mere human authority, however primitive; and more thorough researches (for a specimen of which see *Taylor's Apostolic Baptism*,) have shown that the early usages of the 2nd and subsequent centuries were not uniformly, nor even chiefly, in favor of baptism by immersion, as was supposed by Mosheim, Neander, Schaff, &c. Second, this

patristic usage, if undisputed, is worthless to a Protestant, because it shows just as strongly that we ought to baptize all persons, infants and adults, naked, by a trine immersion, in water previously consecrated, and to accompany it with all the above mentioned unscriptural additions. Immersionists, if they will use the testimony of the Fathers, have no right to retain what suits them and reject the rest.

We now proceed to another little taste, somewhat more pungent, of the incorrigible Courtney's fidelity. Let the reader turn to Theodosia, page 322, and he will find the statements of the Magdeburg Century (a Lutheran work of the 16th century,) introduced with a great pretence of learned familiarity with it and its authors. The knight of the Ferule states it thus:

"They (the Apostles) baptized *only* the adult or aged, whether Jews or Gentiles, whereof we have instances in Acts 2, 8, 10, 16, and 19th chapters. As to the baptism of *infants* we have no example. As to the *manner* of baptizing, it was by *dipping* or *plunging* into the water, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, according to the allusions contained in the 6th of Romans, and 2nd of Colossians." They speak

of the first century: and of the second century they say: "It does not appear from any approved authors, that there was any change or variation from the former century in regard to baptism." The italics, let the reader note, are Mr. Courtney's own.

Now, courteous reader, turn with us to Semler's edition of the Magdeburg Centuries, published in Nuremburg 1758. The cute Courtney, according to his wont, has suppressed all reference to chapter and page; but by internal marks, we recognize the body of his quotation in Century 1, Book II, chapter 6, section entitled *Ritus circa Baptisma.* The authors, after speaking of the places, days, &c., in which, and persons by whom baptism was anciently administered, say:

"That adults were baptized, as well Jews as Gentiles, the examples of Acts 2, 8, 10, 16, 19th prove. Of infants baptized, particularized examples are indeed not found (in the Scriptures;) but Origen, and Cyprian and other fathers are authority that infants were baptized in the time even of the Apostles. This also appears from the writings of the Apostles, that they do not exclude infants from baptism. For while Paul teaches, Colos. 2nd chapter, that baptism

supplies the place of circumcision, he indicates that infants and adults ought equally to be admitted to baptism. Likewise 1 Cor. 2nd chapter, calls the children of believers saints, not indeed on account of their nativity, but because Christian parents commit them to God in their prayers, and offer them to baptism and the washing of regeneration and sanctification, more promptly than Gentile parents."

The mistake which the authors (or their printers) make in referring to 1 Cor. 2nd chapter, where chapter 7th is intended, will not affect the case. The reader will see that the word *only*, which the author of Theodosia introduces, and *italicizes*, is utterly wanting, in the true reading. But it makes all the difference in the passage, which exists between '*yes*,' and '*no*.' And then the authors are found, so far from saying that "*only* adults were baptized by the Apostles," to assert and argue, both from the inspired and uninspired records, that infants also were baptized. They do indeed say that no example is found particularized of an infant baptism; but this is not what they are quoted as saying, in Theodosia. Now whether the author of this wretched story book, manufactured this

misrepresentation for himself, or borrowed it ready manufactured from some other Immersionist raver as unscrupulous as himself, we care not to inquire. Perhaps the latter is true. Most probably he really knows nothing of the Magdeburg Centuriators, and never saw the outside, much less examined the interior of a volume of this work. But why then did he preface his introduction of their pretended testimony with his flippant description of the work and its authors? thus seeking to make the impression that he was entirely familiar with both. Any way, we nail the imposture down, as an attempt to perpetrate an unmitigated lie; an evidence that this scribbler is utterly treacherous, and deserving only of a dismissal from every honest man's attention, with all his pretended facts and arguments.

Next we must beg the reader to bear with us, while we again refute the oft-refuted slander, that the Westminster Assembly, the authors of the Presbyterian Confession and Catechisms, came within one vote of adopting immersion instead of sprinkling. One would think that this tale had been often enough advanced, and often enough proved false, for even the ignorance of this author to be enlightened on the sub-

ject. For instance, in the famous Lexington debate of Rice and Campbell, Mr. Campbell advanced this charge against the Westminister Assembly; and Mr. Rice disproved it nearly in the words which we are about to employ from Lightfoot's works, in such a triumphant way, that Mr. Campbell himself tacitly withdrew the charge. Now, is it likely that the author of Theodosia, himself a Western man, never saw this book, so famous especially throughout the West? Did he again publish the statement after having seen its utter refutation? This is a question which we leave to his own conscience to answer. On page 178 of Theodosia we find it again; as follows:—

"You will there" (Edinb. Encycl.) "learn that in England the Westminster Assembly of Divines had a warm discussion whether immersion or sprinkling should be adopted. But by the earnest efforts of Dr. Lightfoot, who had great interest in the Assembly, sprinkling was adopted by a majority of *one*. The vote stood, 24 for immersion, and 25 for sprinkling. This was 1643 years after Christ. The next year an act of parliament was passed requiring the parents of all children born in the realm to have them sprinkled, &c."

As Dr. Lightfoot's name has been mentioned in connexion with this ridiculous story, we may as well "*scotch*" it by a reference to his life. See London edition of Lightfoot's works, 1684. Author's life, p. 5. The tale is there told thus:

"Upon that proposition relating to Baptism; *it is lawful and sufficient to sprinkle the child*, our author opposed them that worded it in that manner: it being unfit to vote that as lawful only, which every one grants to be so. And whereas one of that Assembly attempted in a large discourse, to prove that (Tebeylah) (which signifies *Baptism*) imports a *dipping overhead;* our author replied at large, and proved the contrary. 1. From a passage of Aben Ezra on Gen. 38. 2. From Rabbi Solomon Jarchi, who, in his commentary on Exod. 24, saith that Israel entered into covenant with sprinkling of blood, and *Tebeylah;* which the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews expoundeth by sprinkling; Heb. 9th. 3. From this, that *John* the *Baptist* sometimes preached and baptized in places where he could not possibly dip those who were baptized. In conclusion he proposed to that Assembly to show him in all the Old Testament, any one instance where the word used *de Sacris*

*et in actu transeunto*, implied any more than *sprinkling*. It is said indeed that the priests washed their bodies, and that the unclean washed himself in water; but this was not a transient action. And when they came to the vote whether the Directory should run thus: *The minister shall take the water and sprinkle or pour it with his hand upon the face or forehead of the child*, some were unwilling to have *dipping* excluded, so that the vote came to an equality within one; For the one side there being twenty-four, and for the other twenty-five. The business was therefore recommitted and resumed the day following; where our author demanded of them who insisted upon *dipping* the reason of their opinion, and that they would give their proofs: Hereupon it was thus worded; *That pouring on of water or sprinkling, in the administration of baptism, is lawful and sufficient.* Where our author excepted against the word *lawful*, as being all one as if it should be determined to be lawful to use bread and wine in the Lord's Supper; and he moved that it might be expressed thus; *It is not only lawful but also sufficient.* And it was done so accordingly."

If the reader has the means of consulting the Westminster Directory, he will find that

the whole article, as it was finally adopted reads thus: "As he (the minister) pronounceth these words, he is to baptize the child with water; which, for the manner of doing it, is not only lawful but sufficient, and most expedient to be, by pouring or sprinkling of the water on the face of the child, without adding any other ceremony." It thus appears that the only subject upon which the Assembly was divided, was this; not whether dipping should be named as the only proper mode; but *whether dipping should be named along with sprinkling and pouring, as one of the admissible modes.* A very different affair this, truly! The whole of the difference which the large minority of twenty-four made was, not that they wished to exclude affusion; but that they were unwilling to totally exclude dipping. Thus this slander is again killed: but perhaps only to be again revived in the next Immersionist novel. It may also be remarked, in dismissing this point, that Dr. Lightfoot, the strength of whose views in favor of affusion may be seen in the above extract, is the great channel, through which English scholars ever since have received a partial knowledge of the Talmudical literature of the Jews. There was then no

man in Great Britain, who had made himself such a master of it. Subsequent scholars who profess to know something of it have mostly done nothing more than borrow from him. We doubt not that there are nine chances to one that whatever the author of Theodosia (or more properly, the predecessors from whom he plagiarized) has picked up about *the learned Maimonides*, was gotten from the Talmudical illustrations of the New Testament written by this very Dr. Lightfoot. And seeing Dr. Lightfoot taught these pretentious *literateurs* what little they know of the matter, it seems to us, the former is more likely to have been a sound judge of the bearing of the Hebrew usages on the mode of Baptism. He, who had thoroughly mastered all the Talmudists had to say of it, was, as we saw above, only strengthened in his belief that affusion was the Bible mode.

Let the reader now advance a little, to pages 179, 180 of Theodosia. He will there find that the fishy Uncle Jones is represented as asking this question: "Did not Cyprian, one of the ancient fathers expressly declare that sprinkling was practised in his day, and was considered valid bap-

tism? I am sure I have received such an impression from some source."

"You probably received it from some Doctor of Divinity," replies the pert pædagogue,—"they are accustomed to make such impressions; but Cyprian says no such thing," &c. &c.

Now good reader, go with us to the original works of Cyprian, letter 69, of the Oxford edition of 1682, page 185, &c.; a letter addressed to a Christian named Magnus; and you will see a case of brazen and hardy impudence detected, which you will scarcely believe a *bad* man could be shameless enough to adventure, in a printed book. We give a translation of Cyprian's own words, rigidly faithful; and we give them somewhat fully, at the risque of tediousness, in order that every one may see for himself the whole connexion and bearing.

"Thou hast inquired also, dearest son, what I think of those who obtain the grace of God in weakness and disease, whether they are to be esteemed legitimate Christians, seeing that they have not been washed with the saving water, but sprinkled. In which particular our modesty and moderation prejudices the opinion of no one, as to his believing whatever he esteems

true, and practising what he believes. So far as our mediocrity hath apprehended the matter, we judge that the divine benefits can in no case be mutilated and weakened, and that no smaller gift which is drawn from the divine munificence, can possibly be bestowed in that case, where it (baptism) is received with the full and entire faith of administrator and recipient. For in the saving sacrament the stain of sins is not washed away, like the soil of the skin and body in a material and secular bath, so that there must needs be nitre, and a vat, a swimming-pool, and the other appurtenances by which the poor body can be washed and cleaned. The breast (heart) of the believer is washed in another wise; the soul of man is cleansed in a different way, by the merits of faith. On the saving sacraments, where necessity compels, and God bestows his indulgence, the abbreviated methods of God confer on those who believe, the whole."

"Nor should the fact, that it appeared the sick person was sprinkled or poured on, when he obtained the Lord's grace, move any one; since the sacred Scripture, by the prophet Ezekiel (36, 25,) speaks and says; 'Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; from all your filthi-

ness, and from all your idols will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you," &c. Likewise in Numbers, xix: 7 and 19: "Then the priest shall wash his clothes, and he shall bathe his flesh in water, and afterward he shall come into the camp," &c. "And the clean person shall sprinkle upon the unclean the third day and on the seventh day." And again; Numb. viii: 7. "And thus shalt thou do unto them to cleanse them: Sprinkle water of purifying upon them, and let them shave all their flesh, and let them wash their clothes, and so make themselves clean." And again; "The water of sprinkling is purification." Whence it appears that the aspersion of water likewise holds good just as the saving washing; and when these things are done under the church, where the faith of both administrator and recipient is sound, all (the effects) can hold good, and be consummated and perfected by the majesty of God, and by the truth of faith. Moreover; as to their calling them not *Christians*, but *Clinics*, who have obtained the grace of Christ by the saving water and legitimate faith, I do not find whence they borrow that name; unless perhaps, persons who have been

reading the larger and more private treatises of *Hipocrates* or *Soranus*, (two medical writers) have discovered (the idea of calling) them *Clinics*. For I, when I read of a *Clinic* in the Gospel, learn that his weakness was no obstacle to that paralytic and weak man, who lay on his bed through the courses of a long life, to hinder his attaining most fully a heaven-born health; Not only was he raised from his bed by the Lord's mercy, but carried his own bed with his renovated strength. And therefore, so far as it is granted to me by faith to apprehend and feel, this is my opinion: That whosoever hath obtained the divine grace of baptism, by the legitimate rule of faith, under the church, be adjudged a legitimate Christian. Or if any one supposes that they (these sprinkled persons) have obtained nothing, but are empty and void, for the reason that they were only sprinkled with the saving water, let them not be so deceived as to be baptized (again) when they shall have escaped the affliction of sickness, and convalesced. But if those cannot be baptized (again) who have been already sanctified by ecclesiastical baptism, why are they scandalized in their faith and the mercy of the Lord? Or have they, indeed, re-

ceived the Lord's grace, but in a shorter and scantier measure of the gift of the divine and sacred Spirit: so as to be esteemed Christians indeed, but Christians who must not be equalled to others? Nay, but the Holy Ghost is not given from a measure, but is poured out entire on the believer. For if the day rises equally upon all, and if the sun is diffused over all with equal and similar light, how much more does Christ, the true Sun and Day, bestow his light of eternal life in the church with a similar equality," &c.

The reader can now see for himself, whether Cyprian did, as Uncle Jones supposed he had somewhere heard, "expressly declare that sprinkling was practised in his day, and was considered valid baptism;" and whether the author has acted honestly in thus roundly denying it. St. Cyprian was converted A. D. 245, martyred 258. During his episcopate in Carthage, he was, on the whole, the most prominent, influential, and able divine in all the Latin part of Christendom. We may safely assume that his opinions were those generally adopted. We do not of course adopt all his arguments, nor his obvious belief in baptismal regeneration; what we wish the reader to

consider is his testimony as to the state of opinion. One thing is obvious, that although unscriptural superstitions about baptism had already proceeded so far, this great and good man regards the position which is now the shibboleth of Immersionists, *that any baptism but dipping is not only irregular, but worthless*, with a disapprobation near to contempt. That was a superstition too rank even for the rapidly corrupting church of the third century. The author says that the Christians of the first three centuries were Baptists. Would any Immersionist preacher now use the above liberal expressions of Cyprian, concerning a man baptized by affusion?

On page 180, Theodosia, the attempt is slyly made to insinuate another erroneous statement concerning the usages of antiquity upon the same subject of clinic baptisms. The schoolmaster continues:

"It appears that a certain man, named Novatian, was taken sick, and was apparently nigh unto death. In this condition he became, as many others have done, greatly alarmed about his condition; and professing faith in Christ, desired to be baptized. But he was too weak to be taken out of bed and put into the water. The

water was therefore, poured around him in his bed. He afterwards recovered, and devoting himself to the ministry, applied for priestly orders, and the question arose, whether one thus 'poured upon' in his bed could be accounted a Christian. Now, it is evident, that if pouring or sprinkling had been a common mode of administering the ordinance, this question would never have been asked."

Here the impression is obviously intended to be made, that the church of the third century considered the insufficiency of Novatus' clinic baptism as a difficulty in the way of his ordination to clerical office; because it seemed doubtful "whether one thus poured upon in his bed could be accounted a Christian." Now we turn to Wall's History of Infant Baptism, (from whom this author doubtless picked out the little and confused knowledge which he has of Novatus' case.) London edition of 1720, vol. II, page 353; and we there find the following testimony—"Tis true, the Christians had then a Rule among themselves, that such an one, if he recovered, should never be preferred to any Office in the Church. Which Rule they made, not that they thought that

manner of baptism to be less effectual than the other; but for the Reason expressed by the Council of *Neocæsarea*, held about 80 years after this Time: The 12th Canon whereof is: *He that is baptized when he is sick, ought not to be made a Priest (for his coming to the Faith is not voluntary, but from Necessity,) unless his Diligence and Faith do afterwards prove commendable, or the Scarcity of Men fit for the office do require it.*"

Bingham, in his *Origines Sacræ*, book IV, chap. 3, §. 11, bears precisely the same testimony—Why did not the author, when borrowing this story of Novatus from Wall, tell the whole truth?

Bear with us, kind reader, if disgust at this man's conduct will permit, while we disclose another instance of his reckless disregard of truth. At the bottom of page 324, he asserts most roundly, in these words: that "there is not on record a single, solitary instance of the baptism of *a child*, till the year of our Lord three hundred and seventy, and that was the son of the Emperor Valleus, which was thought to be dying, and was baptized by the command of his Majesty, who swore he would not be contradicted," &c. &c. (The fellow does not

even falsify neatly, for he is too ignorant to be able to spell the name of the Emperor *Valens*.)

Now if the reader will turn to pages 333, and 337, of Theodosia, he will find that the author actually refers to two or three documents, of the dates, A. D. 200, and 250 nearly: (respectively 170, and 120 years before the year 370) the genuineness of which he himself admits; and of which even the wretchedly perverted extracts which he gives clearly imply the habitual baptism of infants at those dates. One of these is called by the most inept pædagogue, the *Letter* of *Tertullian Bishop* of Carthage, to the lady Quintilla; whereas it is in fact not a letter, but a Book or Treatise, of Tertullian, not Bishop of Carthage, but presbyter, on Baptism; and not addressed to anybody in particular. In this treatise, the superstitious but learned author takes the ground that the baptism of little children, then admitted by plain inference to be prevalent, ought to be delayed, *because baptism washes away all sins committed previously, whereas those committed afterwards are peculiarly damning*. And he argues for the delay of baptism by every argument he can think of, with great zeal. But why did he not cut

the matter short by saying, that early baptism was an unscriptural innovation? No doubt he would have done so, if he could. Another of these documents is the testimony of Irenæus, (who is even earlier than A. D. 200) to the fact that many infants had been "*regenerated.*" The clamorous Courtney disputes that by the phrase "regenerated" Irenæus meant the baptism of the infants; but every good scholar knows that the clamorous Courtney is wrong. A denial so marked by brazen ignorance and impudence deserves no other reply than contempt. The third document is a letter of St. Cyprian, whose acquaintance we have already made, to Fidus—*Fridus*, the accurate knight of the birch makes it; thereby betraying, what is apparent to the intelligent reader all through; that he really knows nothing about the history of which he professes to descant, but is borrowing at second or third hand, from some bungler like himself.—Fidus' question is: Whether the baptism of infants might not to be postponed till the eighth day, as circumcision was? Cyprian answers, No; and the whole tenor of his answer shows that on the question of *baptizing infants*, there was no dispute.

Now what must be the hardihood of this

scribbler, how profound his belief in the stupidity of those for whom he writes; that he should make an assertion on page 324, and himself furnish the refutation of it on page 337? Or did he think to avail himself of the mean quirk, that whereas he had said there was "not on record a *single, solitary* instance of the baptism of a child" till A. D. 370. Tertullian's and Cyprian's testimony only prove the general baptism of infants, not the baptism of a single child by name? Does the value of the historical testimony, as to the customs of the church before A. D. 370, depend on the giving of the *name*, and parents' name, of some child baptized? If the testimony mentioned above does not record a *single, solitary* instance of infant baptism, it is only because it evidences what is a thousand times more destructive to the author's assertion, a general prevalence of infant baptism. The author does indeed answer, with equal feebleness and effrontry, to the question:

"What was the effect of this decree of the African Council?" (which concurred with Cyprian in the answer.)

"It seems to have had none. It is likely that it relieved the doubts of Fridus; and infants were probably baptized in Africa to

some limited extent, but we have no record of any such baptism," &c.

That the reader may see for himself; we now insert a faithful translation of that portion of Cyprian's letter to *Fidus*, which bears on the subject. In the Oxford edition of Cyprian's works, 1682, it is the 64th Epistle, and may be found at page 158. It appears that *sixty-six* clergymen joined Cyprian in the consultation.

"As relates to the cause of the infants, who, you say, should not be baptized within the second or third day of their birth, and that the law of ancient circumcision ought to be observed, so as to determine that he who is born must not be baptized and sanctified within the eighth day; it seemed far otherwise to all in our Council. For no one agreed with you in this which you thought ought to be done; but the whole of us rather judged that the mercy and grace of God should be denied to none that are born of mankind. For since the Lord saith in his Gospel; 'The Son of Man came not to destroy the souls of men but to save,' no soul ought to be lost if it can be, so far as lies in us," * * * * &c. &c.

After some matter not important to our point; Cyprian proceeds:

"For, as for the fact that the eighth day was observed in the Jewish carnal circumcision, it is a sacrament (i. e. baptism) prefigured in a shadow and type, but completed in its truth when Christ came. For, because it was destined to be the eighth day, that is, the first day after the Sabbath, on which our Lord should rise, and revivify us and give us the spiritual circumcision, this eighth day, that is, the first day after the Sabbath, and the Lord's day, was prefigured in the type; which type ceased when the reality supervened afterwards. and spiritual circumcision was given to us," &c.

With the soundness of Cyprian's argument in the last paragraph we have no concern; but only with his historical evidence. And now, is there a man in his senses, who will deny that infant baptism must have been practised before? Or else a clergyman would never have penned such a question, nor would sixty-seven other clergymen have ever penned such an answer—That infants should be of course baptized, is assumed as a postulate, by both questioner and respondents, without a hint of the slightest demurring. The only difficulty is, whether the precedent of circumcision did not require its postponement to the eighth

day. Would such a question and answer ever have been uttered, if infant baptism had not been already *common?* "*Credat Judæus Apelles: non Ego.*" And second: it is evident that both Fidus and Cyprian's Council understood that it was an admitted truth, baptism came in place of circumcision, as is taught by Paul, Colossians ii: 11, 12. Fidus' question is based on that belief. And Cyprian and his colleagues, though differing in the answer, did not say, as they would have done had they disbelieved the relation between circumcision and baptism; "No, baptism is not tied to the eighth day, because it has nothing to do with circumcision." They argue that, though the relation does exist between circumcision and baptism, Fidus' conclusion does not follow.

That we may more fully rebut the assertions of this author concerning the early prevalence of infant baptism, we will briefly add: that Bingham (*Origines Sacræ*, book XI, chap. 4, §. 5 to 12.) cites the very words of *eight* authors, all of whom lived before the year of our Lord 250, and some of whom were cotemporary with the Apostles, from whom he irrefragably argues that infant baptism was prevalent when they wrote. And Wall, in his history of infant

baptism, which this author seems to have used only to pervert, cites seven of the same authorities, with an eighth not cited by Bingham. So that out of the very scanty literature of the first 250 years, here are nine authors of antiquity, who present good ground for asserting the prevalence of infant baptism. From the year 250 onward, the number of witnesses is vastly increased. If the reader would comprehend the strength of this early testimony, he must remember this fact, that of authors who flourished and wrote prior to the year 250, and any of whose works are now extant, Mosheim mentions only about twenty. His list is nearly exhaustive. Of these, there are several whose extant works are exceedingly brief, a mere letter, or fragment. This being the amount of the early literature still surviving, could more testimony to infant baptism be reasonably expected?

We shall close this department of our review by reference to one more assertion of the railing pædagogue, whose cool impudence really quite took away our breath when we read it. See pages 166, 167.

"The fathers, (as they are called,) that is, the earliest writers among the Christians,

whose works have come down to us, were all Baptists. It was near three hundred years before there were any professed Christians who were *not Baptists.*" Now, as we read these astonishing words, we thought to ourselves; This is but a play upon the word Baptist; He means no more than to state in an *ad-captandum* way (very far, indeed, from being honest) the fact that many of the fathers, among their numerous and more important points of difference from modern Immersionists, agreed with them in this one, that they also were infected with the *Hydromania.* On this supposition, the assertion seemed rash enough, and we thought that surely; "the force of nature could no farther go." But no: on the next page he adds that Roman Catholic, Episcopalian, Lutheran, Dutch Reformed, and Presbyterian writers, "have openly, plainly, and repeatedly declared, as historians, that the Apostolic churches were, in their membership—ordinances, organization, and government, just such as the Baptist churches are now—I say I might give this authority, but I will refer you to the same source from which they, as historians, derived their information. I say the Chris-

tian fathers, for the first three centuries, were Baptists, because these fathers say so themselves."

Whew!! This then, is the sweeping proposition; that the fathers themselves say the Apostolic churches were, and continued for three centuries, *just such as the modern Immersionist* churches, in their *membership*, *ordinances*, *organization*, and *government*. Ah, incautious Courtney, if you had known anything at all of these fathers, of whom you pretend to know so much before these innocent, gullible souls; even your immeasurable brass, and reckless hardihood in fibbing, would not have thrust you into such an unfortuate assertion. But let us see what these fathers of the first three centuries were, as to the particulars above named. That the most of them stickled for much water in baptism is true; but it was rather a good scouring than a complete immersion, which they liked. The views of the great body of them as to the *necessity* of an immersion or washing all over, to constitute a valid baptism, we have seen stated by Cyprian. The bulk of them also practised and applauded infant baptism; (baptizing the infants by immersion more uniformly than the adults.) Here then, is

one great difficulty between you, Brother Courtney, and your ancient brethren—In spite of all your scolding, the fact remains, that they were usually guilty of all the enormities of *Baby-dipping*. And then, as to the *mode* of baptism, it is indisputable that these primitive "Baptists," differed from their modern brethren, in the following particulars, (which the schoolmaster of course considers wholly trivial, yea microscopic in importance.) They accompanied their baptism with an anointing with oil, (Do you, oh Pædagogue?) See Bingham, *Origines Sacræ*, Book XI, chapter 9, §. 1. They also signed the baptized person with the sign of the Cross. See §. 3. They consecrated the water beforehand with which the person was to be baptized, by pronouncing an invocation over it, and marking it with the sign of the Cross. Chapter 10, §. 1, 3. Again; all persons, men, women, children, were baptized stark naked, as modern Immersionist writers expressly admit. (Does the Pædagogue advocate this?) See chapter 11, §. 1, 2, and Book II, chap. 22, §. 8. The subject was dipped three times usually; once at the name of each person of the Trinity—§. 6. The baptism was then followed by an imposition of the

Bishop's hands, connected with another unction, to confer the Holy Ghost. Chap. 3. Then the baptized person was clothed in a white garment, sometimes carried lighted candles in his hands, received the kiss of peace, and tasted a little honey and milk. See chapter 4. Such was the baptism of Mr. Courtney's primitive brethren! All these superstitious additions were invented before the expiration of that third century, within which he claims all the good people as of his sect. Such is the suspicious company in which we first find the practice of dipping unmistakeably described. Does it not seem very probable that the dipping originated in the same growing superstition, which invented the chrism, the crossing, the stripping, the blessing of the water, and the white robe?

But we proceed: whereas the schoolmaster claims that all these churches of the first three centuries were just such as his own, in their membership, all the ancient writers concur in saying that the members were universally divided into two classes, full communicants and Catechumens. See Bingham, Book X, chap. 1, the latter of whom were subject to church discipline, and were carried through a separate course of

religious instruction, but were never allowed to witness a baptism or Lord's Supper. This is very much like the modern Immersionist churches, is it not? Again; not to repeat the fact that infant baptism introduced multitudes of infants into the membership, it is abundantly testified by most respectable writers from the year 250 downwards, that the Lord's Supper was commonly given to infants; (another irrefagable proof of the prevalence of infant baptism, by the way,) and that, with the approbation of nearly all. See Bingham, Book XII, chap. 1, §. 3, and Book XV, chap. 4. §. 7. Does brother Courtney "fellowship" this?

But the hardy Courtney asserts also that the primitive church of the first three centuries was identical with his, in its *ordinances*. Let us see Bingham (Book XV, chap. 7,) concurs with *all* the other learned antiquaries in saying, that these Christians celebrated *love feasts* in their churches for several centuries, beginning from a very early date. Do modern Immersionists practise this? Little need be said about the early observance of Easter and Whitsuntide; to which after a little, Christmas and Epiphany were added; or of the Lenten fast preceding Easter, of which we find traces almost as

early as the first uninspired literature. The first two festivals were generally observed as early as A. D. 150. (See Bingham, Book XX, chap. 5.) And then, time would fail us to recite all the superstitious fasts; (as the Wednesday and Friday fasts) the ritual of penance and absolution; the repeated impositions of hands and confirmations, &c. &c., of which the prevalence before A. D. 300, is testified by the general current of fathers. Of course, as the consistent Courtney claims all the Catholic churches as exactly like himself, he also practises all these!

They were exactly like him, he says also, in *organization and government.* Now it is well known that modern Immersionists are Independents in Church Government; and most strenuous assertors of the parity of the ministry; which they carry so far as to exclude ruling elders. Nor do they attribute any authority than that of mere fraternal advice, to any representative church court above the simple church meeting. Now the very earliest uninspired remains, (See Epistles of Ignatius, A. D. 117.) describe all the churches as having the three orders of Bishops, Elders, and Deacons. When we come down to the times of Mr. Courtney's very familiar friends, Cyprian

and F(r)idus, Cornelius and Novatus, about A. D. 245, we find *Diocesan Episcopacy almost universal.* We need hardly insult the reader by offering proof of this; but for the benefit of those who may be as ignorant as the Pædagogue, we cite Bingham, Book IX, chap. 6; Eusebius Hist. Eceles., Book VI, chap. 43. At the latter place, the Pædagogue may find a letter from his friend Bp. Cornelius of Rome, against the clinically baptized Novatus, in which a statement of the organization of the Church of Rome is given—says Cornelius: "This assertor of the gospel then did not know that there should be but one Bishop in a Catholic church! In which however, he well knew, (for how could he be ignorant?) that there were forty-six Elders, seven Deacons, seven sub-Deacons, forty-two Acolyths, Exorcists, readers and Janitors in all fifty-two," &c. Of course the Immersionist church (or do they not say church*es?*) of Nashville is organized on this primitive Baptist model, with a prelatic Bishop (Rev. J. R. Graves is the man, perhaps!) Elders, Deacons, sub-Deacons, Acolyths, Exorcists, Readers and Janitors. If so, then, we pray you, good Exorcists of Nashville, why did you not cast out the lying spirit out of the mouth

of your prophet Courtney, before he was regenerated in the holy water of baptism? And then, not only was the church government of the third century prelatic, there were the *councils*, which met frequently, and legislated for the churches in a most un-congregational manner. If the good reader would know something of them, let him consult Bingham, Book II, chapters 14 to 16. He will there find that they met statedly, from an early date, in every archbishoprick, and legislated authoritatively for the churches under their care.

But we fear our refutation grows tedious by its very fulness: we will therefore briefly close by remarking that the doctrines of *baptismal regeneration*, and in general, of sacramental grace, of the *real presence* in the Lord's Supper, of *penance* and *purgatorial sufferings* beyond the grave, were generally held before the end of the third century. Such were the churches which we hear thus claimed as the same in membership, ordinances, organization and government, with the modern Immersionists? The inference which is to be drawn as to the ignorance and recklessness of this author, need hardly be stated. But there is another inference which we will state. See-

ing that corruptions and departures from the Bible model early became so numerous, so great, and so general, *how much is the testimony worth*, which the fathers of the third and fourth centuries bear in favor of their general (not universal) attachment to dipping? It is worthless. The authority of these fathers is of little value for determining apostolic usages and doctrines: and when it comes in collision with the more sure word of Scripture, as in this case of trine immersion, it is worthless. Pædobaptists therefore depend chiefly on the Bible argument.

11. We suppose that the historical and literary unfaithfulness of this book is now sufficiently exposed, as well as its unscrupulous sophistries. Many other arguments remain unnoticed by us, and many other falsifications of testimony; of which the exposure would be just as easy for us, and crushing for the author, as of those above mentioned. We beg our readers to believe, that if there is any other bold assertion or pretended argument in the book, which strikes him as unfavorable to Presbyterians, if true; we have passed it over, not because there is any difficulty in disproving it; but because we suppose enough

has been said. Why should the intelligent reader be led through a longer series of detected falsehoods, and sophistries, to the increase of his weariness and disgust?—Doubtless he is, before this time, sufficiently nauseated with the "Heroine of Faith," to be ready to thrust her into the fire, picture, ringlets and all!

But the ends of righteousness would be betrayed if we did not advert to another glaring feature of this evil book. This is its harsh invective, aimed at most respectable Protestant denominations, and at many of the best and holiest men whom God has given to the church. Let me give only a few specimens among many. On page 50, (Theodosia Earnest.) the heroine exclaims: "Stop Mr. Percy! Pray stop, and let me think a moment. Can it be possible that a good man, a pious minister of Jesus Christ, could dare to trifle thus with the holy Word of God? Oh it is wonderful!" &c. The civil Courtney then proceeds to relieve her astonishment, by assuring her that she is only beginning to get a little taste of the iniquities of her Pædobaptist Doctors of Divinity. Again; page 52,—Theodosia is made to say; "I begin to think that Theological writers are not to

be relied on at-all"—(Right: sapient maid; especially if they are of the Carson-Courtney school.) On page 60, the latter authority says: "They" (Presbyterian Doctors.) "don't think *their church* can be wrong; and they twist, pervert and torture the Scriptures, as you have seen Mr. Barnes do, or openly set aside their teachings as a matter of 'indifferency,' as we have seen Dr. Chalmers do. in order to continue *the usage of the church.*" Again: on page 176, the uncle of the niece, Prof. Jones, is made to exclaim in *italics*, "*Can it be possible that Doctors of Divinity will impose such falsehoods on their people in order to sustain the practice of the church?*"

But the gall of the pious Pædagogue is more especially stirred when he comes to denounce the practice of infant baptism. Having then an audience of women before whom to display his prowess, his crustiness mounts up to actual profanity; and he fairly earns for himself a crowning title. Hear then the *cursing Courtney*, as his indignation waxes dire against the enormities of "baby-sprinkling," on pages 302, 304, 309.

"In the first place. if you will excuse me for talking so plainly, *infant baptism, as*

*practised by Presbyterians in this country, is a continually repeated falsehood!*"

"I say in the next place that, the baptism of an infant is an act of high-handed rebellion against the Son of God."

"I will now say even more than this; *infant baptism is impious*—it is an act of sacrilege."

We can hardly surmise whether the reader will feel most of indignation or disgust, when he finds the author, amidst the closing sentences of his book, concluding this tirade of misrepresentations and denunciations with a mock-sanctimonious moderation.

"We have finished our ten night's study of Scripture baptism. We have examined it in regard to its mode, its subjects, and its results. We have endeavored to do it plainly and candidly, but if we know our own hearts, we have tried to do it kindly—and in the spirit of that 'charity' which 'rejoices in the truth.'"

Reader, is not this cool? Does it not remind you of the audacity described by the wise man, Prov. xxx: 20, "Such is the way of an adulterous woman; she eateth, and wipeth her mouth, and saith, I have done no wickedness." As to the fiery denuncia-

tions of the sacrament of baptism applied, according to God's ordinance, to the seed of believers, we are not concerned to rebut them. If the reader will turn to the pages indicated, he will find that infant baptism is charged as "a falsehood," "a rebellion," "an impiety," because we administer it, among other meanings, to signify admission to church-membership, regeneration, and remission of sins, in all of which applications to infants the author holds it to be an absurdity. But will even the bold schoolmaster deny that God commanded circumcision to be administered to infants? Then let him turn to Gen. xvii: 11; Deut. xxx: 6; Rom. iv: 11; Col. ii: 11, and he will see that the Holy Ghost declares circumcision to have been a sign and seal of *membership in the visible church*, of *regeneration*, and of *justification*. Was infant-circumcision therefore, also a "continually repeated falsehood," an "act of high handed rebellion," an "impiety and sacrilege?" "*He that reproveth God, let him answer it!* Job. xl: 2. We now take our farewell of this author, leaving him to settle his grievous accusations against the admission of infants to this sacrament, with the Almighty.

We do not profess to have dealt tenderly

with this work; for it deserves and demands, not forbearance, but righteous indignation and chastisement. Our only scruple has been whether it truly deserves so much notice as the effectual exposure of its errors has required, or whether it should be left to run its ignominious course, and work its temporary mischiefs, unchecked save by its own outrages and the contempt which they will ultimately awaken. But we wish here expressly to remind the reader that we have diligently distinguished between this wicked book, and the religious denomination, of whose peculiarities it is an attempted defence. The book we denounce as an outrage; of the denomination we wish we could say nothing, but that we regard it as a true branch of Christ's Church, containing a multitude of true children of God, whom we would fain honor and love as such, notwithstanding our differences. We would be glad to hold this author and his publisher alone responsible for the sin and disgrace of such a publication as Theodosia Earnest. But alas; the Immersionist churches of our country have unfortunately chosen to make a use of it which renders this forbearance impossible. We are told on all hands that the denomination generally have circulated

it with diligence, that they have obtruded it on Presbyterians in an offensive and proselyting spirit, and that not only individuals, but their church colporteurs circulate it with a zeal hardly second to that with which they diffuse the Word of God! The volume in our possession claims to be the eighteenth thousand. A colporteur of that noble and Catholic Society, the American Tract Society told us, that he once entered the house of a decent family in Virginia, and offered to its mother, his Evangelical stores—"I have a book," replied the old lady, "which I would not give for all yours, which I got from a colporteur lately." Here she produced Theodosia Earnest. "I do think it is the best book I ever read in my life, except the Bible!" Thus it seems, *Ecclesiastical agencies* are employed by one of the sisterhood of religious denominations, [professing to serve the same Saviour, and aspire to the same heaven,] not in the work of self-defence, and of instructing her own members in her sincerely-held peculiarities, (for this would be legitimate;) but in the propagation of abuse, prejudices and hatred in uninformed minds against their Pædobaptist brethren, and in the most aggressive and discourteous as-

sault possible, against others outside their pale. We shall not characterize this action of the Immersionist denomination—let us treat it with the forbearance due to brethren misguided. But fidelity requires us to call the reader's attention to its features, that he may estimate its character for himself. This is the chosen vehicle then, for the propagation of Immersionist views: a *work of fiction* the vehicle of sacred truth; and that a work most offensively aggressive in its whole aim and structure, of which the very plot is an insulting bravado over Presbyterians, founded as it is on a case of fictitious triumph over them; a work marked by the most disgraceful dishonesty and perversion of facts; a work of fiery invective and malignant slander; and withal a work as disgraceful to the denomination by its lack of scholarship as by its indecency. Have the Immersionists no scholars to fight their battles, who have knowledge enough to escape the absurd literary blunders we have noted? "Walls History of John the Baptist." "The Pope's *Legislature* at Ravema, A. D. 1311," (a title, we venture to affirm, which would astonish every Papal Canon Lawyer, when applied to a Metropolitan Council,) "Tertullian *Bishop* of

Carthage," (an office he never held,) "Cyprian's letter to Fridus," (for Fidus,) &c., &c. The ignorance of early authorities which are used with so much pretended familiarity, while nothing was really known of them by the author has been already exposed. Those citations were evidently picked up at third, or possibly, *at tenth hand*, from wretched, compilations of pretended history, whose literary credit was exploded again and again, and so long ago, that all scholars had dismissed them to the subterranean caverns of forgetfulness.

Now we ask: Reader, is this the sort of weapon which Immersionists put forward, as their best implement of denominational warfare? Then *they* must think that their cause is at a low ebb indeed! Surely nothing less than desperation would have led them to clutch so sorry a dependence, and so to violate the courtesies and amenities of denominational intercourse! Let us illustrate the nature of this polemic assault. The High Church Episcopalians are not noted for peculiar courtesy and forbearance towards other Protestant churches, in their denominational warfare. But some years ago when similar objections were urged against the official circulation of a polemic

work, not one-tenth part so offensive to Presbyterians, as this Theodosia Earnest, the book of Mr. Flavel S. Mines, that circulation was discontinued by the Episcopal authorities, and the book was suppressed, so far as the ecclesiastical publication of it went. Mr. Mines professed to give the reasons which had influenced him, and, he surmised, were influencing three hundred other Presbyterian ministers, to pass into the Episcopal communion. Presbyterians objected that his tone was offensive to us, that his statements of fact were heedless and inaccurate, and that the very form of the book was aggressive towards us. The consequence was, that High Church authorities retracted their use of it against us; although they deny to us validity of ministry and ordinances, and the very character of a church. Now, will our protest against a case ten times as offensive as Mr. Mines' book, induce the *High Church Immersionist* to recede? We shall see.

12. Our readers were informed at the outset, that we did not propose to write a complete argument on baptism, because we considered it unnecessary. But we shall beg leave to state with some degree of fulness three ideas, to which as we suppose, it

is desirable the minds of Presbyterians should be very distinctly directed at this time.

(*a.*) A part of the boldness and success of Immersionists has been occasioned by the indifference of Presbyterians to the narrow and comparatively trivial subject of the mode of baptism. This indifference, though injurious in its results, was in truth noble in its motive. It is not the spirit of Presbyterians, to attach importance to ritualism; and the question of the more or less water in baptism, where the substance and meaning of the sacrament were retained, we properly regarded as a matter of ritualism. To attach importance to such things, was alien from the temper of Presbyterianism, as it is from the temper of the N. Testament. The liberal principles of Presbyterians, one of the most catholic of all denominations in its admission of all other denominations which retain any substance of saving truth, as sisters in the visible church Catholic, also induced us to treat the peculiarities of other classes of brethren in the body of Christ, with a forbearance which seemed almost to overlook the right of self-defence against them. But now we must treat immersion as an important matter, not

because it is so in itself; but because Immersionists will persist in making it so, by assailing "the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free." Presbyterians should therefore be better informed concerning the modes in which their usage is attacked and defended. We would say emphatically that one of the prominent objects now in our view, is to call attention to the many excellent and accessible works (the existence of which has rendered a formal argument of the merits of the question unnecessary on our part;) and to urge Presbyterian readers to procure and study some of them. We shall be pardoned for calling attention just here, to a very clever and creditable book, published by a "member of the Alabama Conference," in answer to Theodosia Earnest. It is entitled "*Theophilus Walton;*" and under the cover of a very simple plot, introduces a discussion of most of the points made by the Immersionist. While we do not approve of the imitation of the bad precedent of teaching truth by fiction, not even for purposes of refutation, it must still be said that the expedient is used by the author of *Theophilus Walton* in an inoffensive manner: the plot is so simple that it is but little more than a thread to connect

the successive discussions, and the temper of the book is eminently pleasant and forbearing. While we would not vouch for the soundness of all the positions assumed, the argument is generally sound and ingenious. We can assure the reader that if he has been vexed at the glaring sophistries and falsehoods of Theodosia Earnest, he will find in the perusal of this reply, amusement and satisfaction, which will fully compensate his previous annoyance.

There are then, several other works, which can be procured at almost any bookstore, which will be found timely and conclusive. Among the smaller of these may be mentioned *Hunt's Bible Baptist*, and *Dr. Daniel Baker's* treatise on Baptism. Next will be found a small duodecimo volume, published by the Presbyterian Board of Publication, and written by *Dr. Fairchild.* This little work can hardly be too much commended, for its simplicity of style, condensation of matter, and Christian temper. Here, in the compass of a hundred and seventy-five little pages, and expressed with a perspicuity level to the capacity of a child, the reader will find a discussion which meets almost every point usually advanced by Immersionists, and meets them triumphantly.

If the reader wishes to pursue his examination farther, we would commend to him *Taylor's Apostolic Baptism*, a work of unsurpassed vigor of logic, and profound learning. Yet this also is a duodecimo volume, written by the learned Editor of Calmet's Dictionary, and published in America in cheap form. So far as we are informed, both English and American Immersionists have treated this work ever since its publition with a prudent silence; although invited to disprove its facts or refute its reasonings, by the author.

But last, and chiefest, we would commend to our readers another work produced by one of our living ministers in Virginia; *Armstrong on Baptism*. In this book, admirable alike for its plan, its temper, its ability, and its manly scholarship, the author leaves aside all the learned lumber of Rabbinical and Patristic usages, except so far as they illustratrate Scripture, and proceeds to expound one by one the passages of the Word of God, where the Sacrament of baptism enters. When he has completed this, he stops; and leaves the faith of his reader resting upon the word of God alone. Every Presbyterian in the land should procure this work, and master its contents,

These works we mention, not as exclusive of others, but as the most accessible, brief, and appropriate to the present stage of the discussion.

The forbearance of Presbyterians has not only led them to neglect the study of this subject, but also to yield tacitly to the *verbal assumptions* of which Immersionists have made such successful use. It is not wonderful indeed, that they should be aggressive, boastful, rampant; when Pædobaptists so neglect the duties growing out of infant baptism, and so loosely grant the perverted and unscriptural use of language propagated in the Protestant world by the prevalence of Anabaptist sentiments. How often do we hear Presbyterians, thoughtlessly and inconsistently speak of a baptized person as *joining the church*, when he comes to his first communion? He has been a member of the church from his birth! How often do we hear the term baptism conceded to Immersionists as they use it for their exclusive dipping? Yea we have even heard an adult Presbyterian say: "Did you know that Miss —— was *baptized* last Sabbath?" when the meaning of the question was, that, the misguided young person had committed the great sin of attempting to

discredit and annul the holy sacrament of baptism administered to her in infancy by pious parents, by causing herself to be dipped by an Immersionist! If God's people will thus betray God's truth, by a heedless or ignorant use of terms; what is the wonder, that general misunderstanding and scorn of the truth should prevail? Let our phraseology be strictly reformed; it will be a preparation for the more important reform of that neglect of the baptized members of God's Church, by which, as parents, communicants, and church-officers, we so much discredit this important and beneficent institution of our God. In the very *name* which the Immersionists arrogate, and which we (with insensate stupidity) concede to them, there is contained a *petitio principii*, an assumption of the point in debate, which has gained them hundreds of thousands of converts. They call themselves BAPTISTS; as if they forsooth, alone of all Christians, had that sacrament of God's house! And we re-echo the title, and speak of them as BAPTISTS; as if forsooth, we acknowledged the arrogant assumption! But the truth is, that all the true branches of the Protestant family, are at least as much BAPTISTS, as those who dip. For they use

a mode, valid indeed, but less strictly scriptural than ours; and they only baptize a part of those whom God commands to baptize. Nay, Presbyterians are the BAPTISTS; and they are *Immersionists*. We owe it to ourselves; yea, we owe it to God's truth, to correct our language. Nor can these brethren complain of the title of Immersionists, inasmuch as they themselves clamorously declare that immersion alone is baptism. Least of all can they complain now, when they are actually engaged in manufacturing a new Bible, thus violating the catholicity of the Protestant family of churches, in order to get the word *Baptize* out of the English Scriptures. They berate King James' translators without end, because they retained this wicked Greek word '*baptize*' dressed up in English letters, in their translation, instead of translating it '*dip;*' as, they say, should have been done. And yet *Baptist* is their chosen title for themselves! Now we are determined, for one, gentlemen Dippers, that you "shall not *eat* your cake and *have* it too." If you say '*Dip*' is the word, '*dip*' let it be, throughout the chapter; and while we call ourselves Presbyterian, Bible Baptists, you shall be *Immersionists*, or if it likes you better, *Dippers*,

and nothing else. The latter is indeed the proper word; for those who object to '*baptize*,' as a Greek word in English dress, should still more object to the barefaced, and more recent foreigner, *immerse;* which is yet more Latin, than baptize is Greek. How vastly would the great Immersionist denomination be shorn of its arrogant prestige, if all the Protestant world should take them at their word, and compel them to the consistency of going by the name of *The Religious Denomination of Dippers?* Words have potent influence; as these dipping Christians know.

And here a word may properly be introduced to show the folly and insincerity of all this movement for Bible Revision. The plea is, that the Greek word must be translated into '*immerse*,' and not transferred. Now if it were true that immerse is its proper equivalent (which we utterly deny as to the Bible,) the plea would be false: for whenever any word receives an established use as the name of an ecclesiastial ordinance, it has thereby undergone a change of signification; it has become a technical word; it has passed out of its general into a special application—Even the Immersionist does not in truth regard '*dip*' as equivalent

to '*baptize.*' He thinks baptizing is *by dipping*, but is a dipping of different sort, meaning and intent, from dipping in general. So that were their pretended desire granted; were the word *immerse* used throughout God's word; and the popular language of the church, as the sacramental word; it would immediately pass into a sacramental meaning, and would no longer be significant merely of *mode*, as Immersionists assert *baptizo* was. It would forthwith require, and receive, its definition as to mode. Hence, and because of the success which the Immersionists gain by their unauthorized assumption of the exclusive name of Baptists, we do not believe that they mean to give up the word '*baptize*' in their English Scriptures. They are not foolish enough to do it: We wish they would. We venture the prediction, that the famous English Version of the Baptist Version Society will never be put into the hands of their people as a Bible for use. Come gentlemen: We dare you to the venture! Expunge your pretended eye-sore, "BAPTIZE" out of your popular version, if you will; but then remember that when you do that, you also surrender that unauthorized title, snatched by a glaring sophistry from your brother

Christians, the title of BAPTISTS; which has won you more accessions from the ignorant and unthinking, than ever Constantine's Legend, read as he pretended in the skies, (*In hoc signo vince*) secured for him from superstitious Rome. No, you will not do it; you will use the revision movement as a good stone to pelt Pædobaptists with, as long as it serves this turn; and then the unuttered and unutterable labors of Messrs. Conant & Co., will be consigned to 'the tomb of all the Capulets.'

(*b.*) The controversy now exciting attention in America, between the advocates of open and close Communion, furnishes us with a most just and unanswerable *argumentum ad hominem*, against the Immersionist dogma. The party of close communion argue in substance thus: "Nothing is valid baptism but immersion; therefore all unimmersed persons are unbaptized.—But baptism is the initiatory sacrament, as all Christians, in all ages agree. None (in customary cases at least) can properly approach the Lord's Table, except through the door of baptism. Therefore, whatever our personal esteem and love for the unimmersed Christians, we have no option to admit them to the Lord's Table." This

argument Immersionists say they regard as unanswerable; yea, they say Pædobaptists themselves cannot dispute the conclusion if the premise is admitted. So be it, say we; for the present.

Then on the other hand, we have the immortal argument of Robert Hall, which begins from premises which Immersionists least of all, can dispute, and proves to a demonstration the opposite conclusion. "The visible church should consist of true believers; and should be the organized counterpart of that portion of the spiritual body of Christ which is on earth, the effectually called. The Lord's Supper symbolizes the communion of true believers in the spiritual feeding upon the atonement and redemption of Christ. Who, then, should partake of the bread and wine? Those obviously, who feed on Christ by faith. But multitudes of Pædobaptists are obviously true believers, whose eminent faith and holiness we Immersionists might well emulate. They are not immersed, but they obviously consider themselves as baptized; and their error is one of those unconscious misunderstandings, to which human infirmity subjects good men. Ten thousand noble instances of their conscientiousness prove that they would die

sooner than disobey the Saviour's command to be baptized, if they apprehended it as we do. In a word, Christ accepts them; and we cannot reject whom he accepts. How can we, how dare we, debar from his Supper on earth, those beloved ones whom we assuredly believe He will welcome to the marriage supper of the Lamb? Is the poor earthly table, the symbol of the true, more holy than that celestial Board. at which the Redeemer and his glorified saints will drink the wine new in his kingdom? How can we thus rend the united body of Christ, and be innocent?"

To this argument also, all the best and noblest of Immersionists minds have yielded, as unanswerable. And ten thousand of those who were too bound by their narrow system to obey it, have yet responded to its force, by the anguish, and ineradicable dissatisfaction with which their generous Christian hearts have bowed to the iron trammels of their rule. Ever since the days when those two giants, Hall and Fuller, represented the two sides of open and close communion, the great cause has remained undecided before the Immersionist public.—From their premises, neither argument can, be overthrown; and yet both cannot be true!

for they assert contradictions. How then, is the strange result to be explained? The answer is very plain to the dispassionate mind; Since both trains of reasoning are correct, the error must be in the premises. But the premises of Hall's argument are as indisputable as the Gospel: they are but the Gospel itself. Then the premises of the other must be false. It cannot be true that immersion is the only valid baptism; that he who has sincerely, honestly complied with Christ's institution as he supposed, by affusion, is wholly unbaptized in fact. Thus, the insuperable difficulties with which the close communion theory is burdened in every right mind, remain a standing evidence of the error of its first principles.

(*c.*) Our third remark is one of which the practical importance can scarcely be overestimated by Presbyterians in their argument with the Immersionists. We should always insist upon their carrying out their principles with consistency, to their legitimate conclusions: and then the enormity and error of those principles will be revealed, to their own minds perhaps; more certainly to the minds of the dispassionate public. Let the reader bear in mind then, that all parties are agreed, baptism is the initiatory

sacrament, which gives membership in the visible Church of Christ. The great Commission was: Go ye and disciple all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Trinity. Baptism constitutes the outward discipleship. Least of all will any Immersionist dispute this ground. Now if nothing is baptism except immersion, if all other supposed forms are not only irregular, but null and worthless, all unimmersed persons are out of the visible Church of Christ. They have no membership in it whatever. But if each and every member of the Presbyterian body is unchurched, that whole body is of course unchurched. When the potent fairy in the fable turned each soldier of the advancing army to a mouse, of course there was no longer an army at all. If each separate block in the walls of a house, which is claimed to be a stone house, is proved to be a brick, the house is not a stone house. No Immersionist therefore can admit that there is any such thing as a *Presbyterian church.* The same argument applies similarly to all Episcopalians, Lutherans, Methodists, Congregationalists; in a word, to all the bodies called Pædobaptist. They are not churches; their claim to be such is a mistake, an assumption, an intrusion. All

are unchurched. And of course, they have no ministry. How can a man *hold office* in that commonwealth in which he has not obtained citizenship? And how can an unauthorized herd of individuals, aggregated illegally and irregularly, confer valid office? There are then, no ministers of the gospel in the world, except Immersionist ministers. The assumption of all others to act as God's ambassadors, and to perform the ordinances of His House, is therefore unauthorized, yea profane and wicked. Ought a good church-member then, to countenance them as ministers, to encourage them in their profane intrusions, by their presence, approbation, and respect? Surely not: such intruders must be treated by consistent servants of God. in all their pretended official doings, as they are treated when they propose to come to the Lord's (Immersionist) Table; firmly repelled. The title of *Reverend* ought not to be conceded to them, lest we should become partakers of their sins. And as to the practice of some misguided Christians, the practice of employing these unbaptized intruders to preach and labor in union-meetings, of inviting them to ascend the pulpits of God's true (Immersionist) churches, to profane a

sacred spot and sacred function, of sitting with pleased and respectful attention under their pretended preaching; it is naught but a glaring inconsistency. No thinking and honest church member can be betrayed into it. And whenever a Pædobaptist minister sees the error of his ways, and comes into the true (Immersionist) church, he must of course be re-baptized, and *re-ordained.*

Again; if these unauthorized societies are not *churches*, of course they have no sacraments; for sacraments are ordinances of *God's House.* They can not go outside of the pale of his visible church. The same severe sentence should therefore be passed by Immersionists on all instances where they pretend to celebrate the Lord's Supper, which the fiery pædagogue passed upon the baptism of infants. Since Christ has ordained that (usually at leas ) the emblems of his body and blood shall be given to none except those who have "followed him in baptism," all these sacraments are just so profane, just so false, just so truly a rebellion against the King of Zion, just so impious and sacrilegious, as is "baby-sprinkling." For a member of the true (Immersionist) church to countenance these abominations

by participating, ought therefore to be in every case, ground of stern discipline; and no plea of the soft influences of fraternity and love should be permitted to interfere with the dictates of high principle. All these profane intrusions of the unbaptized into 'things too high for them,' should indeed not be visited with persecution and civil penalties, enormous as they are; for Christ has said; "Vengeance is mine; I will repay." But his servants are bound to testify their disapprobation of them, in all their religious acts when they are brought into contact with these misguided, sprinkled people, falsely called Christians. Some of them may be at bottom good people; but such cases must be the exception and not the rule, as in that Synagogue of Satan, the Romish Communion; for whatever their feelings, they are outside of the visible church; and out of this there is no *ordinary* possibility of salvation. It is *to the church*, not the world, that "the oracles of God are committed," with all their promises and provisions of grace.

Such are the fair and inevitable results of the dogma that nothing but immersion is valid baptism. We defy human wit to evade them successfully. All Pædobaptists

therefore should press the Immersionists with these odious consequences, (as it is perfectly fair and righteous we should) until they either avow them, or give up their odious dogma. They should be made to shoulder the consequences of their own principles like men; or else repudiate those principles like men. Let us say to every Immersionist; "You must treat me in all respects as no church member, my minister is no minister, my sacraments and ordinances as profanations of sacred things; or else, shall I say to you in the elegant and fraternal language of the author of Theodosia Earnest? 'These stand as your dogmas in your Confession of Faith,' and yet, in truth, neither your ministers nor you *have ever believed them to be such;* or else you are more inconsistent in your conduct than sensible men are often found to be.'" (Page 236.) Come, gentlemen Immersionists; 'face the music;' act up to your principles; let us have no temporizing for popularity's sake. Such skittishness in acting consistently, does not become those who have given that supereminent evidence of faith, obedience to principle, and moral heroism, "following their Lord into the liquid grave."

Yes; let Immersionists be *forced*, by the

righteous pressure of truth and reason, to act up to their professed principles, and the unthinking public will awaken to an indignant discovery, that the principles of this denomination, so given to make capital among soft hearts and heads, by calling itself a 'poor and humble flock every where spoken against,' is in fact, in its principles most intensely arrogant of all High Church Sects, not excepting Prelatists; and that this denomination, professedly most Protestant and thoroughly reformed, is in fact most intensely formalistic. A clerical Ishmaelite, *Elder Sledge*, lately screwed his courage up to the point of acting out his principles, just as all Immersionists should act them out, in the city of Memphis; and the award of the Christian public was one of universal reprobation. Even an Immersionist Editor (good thoughtless soul; he had not comprehended the consequences of his professed principles:) at a distance, declared that the story must be a quiz; because it was incredible that any professed Protestant minister could be guilty of such a piece of atrocity, worthy only of a Fejee Islander. Let the religious public look at the conclusion to which Immersionism conducts us! It is this: that such men as John

Owen, Richard Baxter, George Whitefield, John Wesley, Summerfield, Brainerd, Henry Martyn, Schwartz, were not ministers of Jesus Christ; while such blots on the Christian name as the Fejee Sledge, and the rabid author of Theodosia Earnest, and every whiskey distilling, and whiskey drinking Ironside, were. True, God gave to the former every gift and grace which can approximate man to the Seraphs; true the baptism of the Holy Spirit and of fire was theirs; true they wore out laborious lives in imitation of the Divine Prophet who "went about doing good;" true, listening thousands drank from their lips the streams of truth and salvation which make glad the city of our God; true, Jesus Christ set the seal of his approbation upon their service by pouring forth the Holy Spirit through their word, and giving them a multitude of souls for their hire; true, the sanctity of their lives, and triumphs of their holy deaths, were ensamples for which the people of God will bless him to the latest age, and every one believes that they have received the award: "Well done good and faithful servant," and have entered into the joy of their Lord, where they ever wear a crown starred with ransomed souls. But for all

this, they were not ministers of Christ's Church; because, although they supposed they had complied fully with Christ's command to be baptized, *enough water* had not been used! And the same condemnation must also be passed upon the communions in which they lived and labored. Those bodies hold fast the Word of God, on all essential points except this one point of ritualism; they are orthodox in doctrine, and comparatively pure in morals; their members have been as abundant in every good fruit of sanctity and benevolence; their assemblies are the chosen scenes for the effusions of God's regenerating Spirit; around those communion tables, and baptismal founts, where are enacted their unauthorized and profane mimickries of God's sacraments, have flowed the purest floods of penitential sorrow, of fraternal love, of fragrant contrition, of adoring gratitude, of rapturous joy, of heavenly hope; their preachers are the ornaments of the pulpit, and the literary lights of the religious world; their gifts and labors have spread Bibles and missionaries into a thousand of the dark places of heathenism, and are doing the chief part of all that is done to conquer an apostate world to King Emmanuel; in their houses of wor-

ship tens of thousands of souls are born into the church Invisible and General Assembly of the First Born; and they send up to heaven from rejoicing death beds, crowned with the richest consolations of the Holy Ghost, a continuous harvest of ransomed souls. But they are not true churches of Christ, for all that! They are effecting, in as good measures as any other society on this earth, all the purposes for which God founded his church; but they are not true churches: because, in an unconscious and honest mistake, they use *too little water* in the outward part of the sacrament of baptism. Yet, every Immersionist society infected with the barbarity of the Fejee Sledge; every Ironside, Antinomian congregation. where the very name of discipline and sanctity is forgotten, all the colored churches of the Southern States, overshadowed as they are with semi-pagan ignorance and delusion. are true churches of our Holy Redeemer, because forsooth they have been baptized with enough water! Is this, we pray, the spirit of Protestantism of the New Testament, of a spiritual dispensation? Is it by such a test as this that the pure spouse of Jesus Christ is to be discerned from the world? If so, what is there of

more intense ritualism, what more profoundly formalistic in the dogmas of old, dead, wooden, superstitious Popery? Not only does the understanding reject such a conclusion: the moral sense abhors it. But this is the conclusion to which every Immersionist must inevitably come, who consistently holds that nothing is baptism except immersion.

Our policy then should be to hold them to this consequence of their creed, until they are willing to disavow that creed. Let the whole community be made to see this new form of High Churchism unmasked, and to comprehend its deformity. Such is our confidence in the solid good sense and right moral instincts of the people, we believe this one view will be more effectual to give them proper views of Immersion, than all the volumes of verbal criticism which have ever been written on the subject. Let the High Churchism of this water-doctrine be understood; and the native sense of justice of the American people will consign its advocates ultimately into that lean minority, in which we now find those ecclesiastical Chinamen, the Puseyites. One of the most significant traits of the novel under review is its evident squinting towards the extreme

view on this subject. We notice that the word *church* is never, or very rarely, applied to Pædobaptist communities. No doubt, its anonymous author, like its publisher, rejoices in the invidious title of an Old-Landmark-man. And this is one among the many symptoms which appear in this work and its circulation, portending, not that rapid spread of Immersionism, and new access of successful activity, which some Presbyterians seem to anticipate, but approaching confusion and defeat. These extravagances of denominational pride and zeal are rather the indications of dissatisfaction, conscious failure, and internal disorder, than of secure strength. "Pride goeth before destruction, and a haughty spirit before a fall."

In conclusion, we have only to say that the reprobation which has been candidly expressed in this Review, is aimed, not at the Immersionist denomination, but at those individuals in it, who discredit and injure it, by odious sentiments or acts. We repeat, that for that church, we desire to express only Christian respect. If in any thing we are compelled to disapprove their denominational action, we would wish to utter that disapproval in the language of moderation

and peace. Many of its members, whom we have the privilege to know, we honor for their orthodoxy and piety, and for a spirit more generous than their technical creed. Doubtless there are multitudes of such.

We have, as we conceive justly, objected to the anonymous and irresponsible character of the book criticised. It is but right therefore that we should add; if any person feels aggrieved by those criticisms, the Editors of the Central Presbyterian are authorized to inform him who is to be held responsible therefor. While we do not affirm that everything in temper, manner, and expression, has been what it should be, we hold ourselves ready to maintain the facts and arguments asserted in the above pages, "against all comers."